

ROUTLEDGE FOCUS



GALLUS REBORN

A Study of the Diffusion and Reception of
Works Ascribed to Gaius Cornelius Gallus

Paul White

ROUTLEDGE

Focus

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

Gallus Reborn

Gallus Reborn is the first comprehensive study of the publication history and reception of the works that have been attributed to Gaius Cornelius Gallus, first canonical Roman elegist, friend of Virgil, and ‘missing link’ in Roman literary history.

Gallus was a widely read and frequently imitated author from the Renaissance onwards, when he overcame the disadvantage of having no surviving works by putting his name to a substantial body of *pseudepigrapha*: misattributed, faked or forged poems. This monograph asks what Gallus was like, during that phase of his existence; how was he read, and by whom; and what impact did he have on literary history?

Combining close readings of the texts with a comparative overview of their wider reception, *Gallus Reborn* will interest scholars and advanced students of classical reception, neo-Latin, comparative literature and early modern studies.

Paul White is Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Leeds. His research focuses on Latin poetry and its reception, with a particular focus on Renaissance humanism; publications include articles on poetry, education, authorship and print culture in Latin and vernacular contexts, and books on the early modern reception of Ovid’s *Heroides* (Columbus, 2009), and on the classical editions and commentaries of the Paris-based printer and author Jodocus Badius Ascensius (Oxford, 2013).

Routledge Focus on Classical Studies

This new series, part of the Routledge Focus short-form programme, provides a venue for the most up-to-date research in the field of Classical Studies. The series covers a range of topics, from focussed studies on specific texts, figures, or themes, to works on wider issues.

Available titles:

Prophets, Prophecy, and Oracles in the Roman Empire

Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman Cultures

Leslie Kelly

Theophrastus' *Characters*

A New Introduction

Sonia Pertsinidis

Gallus Reborn

A Study of the Diffusion and Reception of Works Ascribed to

Gaius Cornelius Gallus

Paul White

For more information about this series, please visit: [www.routledge.com/
Routledge-Focus-on-Classical-Studies/book-series/FOCUSCLSS](http://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Focus-on-Classical-Studies/book-series/FOCUSCLSS)

Gallus Reborn

A Study of the Diffusion and
Reception of Works Ascribed
to Gaius Cornelius Gallus

Paul White

First published 2019
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2019 Paul White

The right of Paul White to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: White, Paul, 1978- author.

Title: Gallus reborn : a study of the diffusion and reception of works ascribed to Gaius Cornelius Gallus/Paul White.

Other titles: Routledge focus on classical studies.

Description: Abingdon, Oxon : Routledge, 2019. |

Series: Routledge focus on classical studies | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019008072 | ISBN 9780367200596 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780429521607 (pdf) | ISBN 9780429549779 (mobi) | ISBN 9780429535079 (epub3)

Subjects: LCSH: Maximianus, active 6th century--Appreciation. | Maximianus, active 6th century--Criticism and interpretation.

Classification: LCC PA6511.M6 W48 2019 | DDC 871/.01--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019008072>

ISBN: 978-0-367-20059-6 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-25939-5 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Swales & Willis, Exeter, Devon, UK

Contents

Introduction: ‘neget quis carmina Gallo?’	1
1 Six elegies ascribed to Cornelius Gallus: Maximianus	4
2 The reception of Gallus-Maximianus	19
3 The ‘Carmen ad Lydiam’ (<i>‘Lydia bella puella candida’</i>)	25
4 From <i>senectus</i> to <i>amor</i>	31
5 Elegiacs attributed to Gallus in 1588 (<i>AL</i> 914–917)	38
6 The forger of the 1588 elegiacs	49
Conclusion	59
Appendix: <i>Editiones principes</i> of works ascribed to Gallus, or date of first attribution to Gallus in print	61
<i>Bibliography</i>	65
<i>Index</i>	73

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

‘Neget quis carmina Gallo?’

Gaius Cornelius Gallus left nothing but a painful absence. For almost two millennia the poems of the first canonical Roman elegist, with the exception of a single pentameter line,¹ were consigned to utter oblivion. Over the centuries his loss has been keenly felt by lovers of classical literature as a peculiar sort of bereavement. In 1502 Pomponio Gaurico, in an elegiac poem on the theme *ubi sunt*, mourned the loss of Gallus, echoing a famous line of Martial: ‘Eloquar, ah facinus, tua nunc ubi Galle Lycoris? / Ah ubi ubi ingenium Galle poeta tuum?’ (‘Could I say—what an outrage!—where your Lycoris is now, Gallus? / Where o where, poet Gallus, is your genius?’). The discovery in 1978 at Qaşr Ibrīm of a papyrus fragment bearing nine lines by Gallus caused a sensation in the pages of the learned journals;² but the bargaining stage of grief has since subsided into depression. Acceptance may never come.

To utter oblivion? No. The influence that Gallus had during the intervening period of literary history has been severely underestimated: in fact, Gallus was a widely read and frequently imitated poet from the Renaissance onwards, when he overcame the disadvantage of having no surviving works by putting his name to a substantial body of *pseudepigrapha*. The Renaissance Gallus had a real existence, and his works really were read, appreciated and imitated. The fact that all of the works by Gallus that circulated in the Renaissance were misattributions, fakes and forgeries³ should not prevent us from asking the questions: what was Gallus like, during the Renaissance phase of his existence, how was he read, and what impact did he have on literary history?

In order to answer these questions it will be necessary for us to wilfully disarrange—but not entirely disregard—what we think we know of the real Gaius Cornelius Gallus.⁴ Our quest for the Renaissance Gallus will take us from the Gallus celebrated by Virgil in the sixth and tenth *Eclogues* and canonized by the elegists Propertius and Ovid, to (among

2 Introduction

others) the elegiac corpus of ‘Maximianus’, the lyric *Lydia bella puella candida*, and the poems published under Gallus’s name by the younger Aldus Manutius in 1588. The first prefect of Roman Egypt, whose suicide in 26 bc at the age of forty-three was compelled by his former friend Octavian, will be transformed into an ageing soldier-poet fighting in the Parthian campaign of Publius Ventidius, and into a dissolute geriatric lamenting his impotence and his lost youth. The scion of Euphoriion, dedicatee of Parthenius, writer of a Callimachean poem on the Grynæan grove, and author of the four books that assured his place as the first Roman love elegist, will become a writer of ersatz Catullan lyrics and of elegies derivative of Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid.

In Chapter 1, we begin in 1502, year zero for the Renaissance Gallus. Pomponio Gaurico’s edition of *Cornelii Galli Fragmenta* had an immediate impact, and would continue to shape the reception of Gallus for centuries to come. It contained both the elegiacs of Maximianus, the subject of this chapter, and *Lydia bella puella candida*, discussed in Chapter 3. My argument will be that the perplexing success and durability of the attribution of the Maximianus elegiacs to Gallus—which, on the surface of it, has little to recommend it except wishful thinking and a few superficial coincidences—is best understood through a close consideration of the metapoetic functions of the elegies themselves, which Renaissance humanists found particularly amenable to the preoccupations of their age. In the second chapter, I go on to consider how, and by whom, Gallus-Maximianus was read during his period of ascendancy. Who took these poems to be genuine works of Gallus, and what did they find worthwhile in them? How did they reconcile the style and content of the Maximianus elegiacs with their expectations of what the poetry of Gallus should be like, and how did their readings transform conceptions of Gallus? In Chapter 3 I consider how and why *Lydia bella puella candida*—by far the most widely imitated of all the pseudo-Gallan poems—became associated with Gallus (and with Gallus-Maximianus), and investigate the reasons for its success. In Chapter 4 I reflect on how the two main strands in the reception of Gallus (the poet of old age and the poet of love), fed into the broader literary culture, and survey neo-Latin and vernacular imitations of Gaurico’s Gallus. Chapters 5 and 6 treat the elegiacs attributed to Gallus in the 1588 Aldine edition (*Anthologia Latina* 914–917), with the aim of proving, against recent attempts to establish their authenticity, that they are Renaissance forgeries. The date and authorship of these poems have been the subject of a continuing debate since their first appearance, but none of the arguments has been conclusive, despite the interventions of such names as J. J. Scaliger, Wernsdorf, Riese, and Mariotti; of the latest contributions to the debate, one, in 2011, ascribed authorship to Cornelius

Gallus, and another, in 2017, to a poet of ancient or late antique date. I will establish here that the Aldine elegiacs were forged by Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus. Finally, the appendix itemizes all of the pseudo-Gallan works known to me to have circulated during the print era, ordered by *editio princeps* or date of earliest print attribution.

Notes

- 1 ‘uno tellures dividit amne duas’: transmitted, with ascription to ‘Gallus’, in the *De fluminibus* of the late antique geographer Vibius Sequester, and now generally accepted as a genuine line of Cornelius Gallus. The existence of the line seems to have escaped the notice of commentators and scholars until 1624, when Kaspar von Barth linked it to Cornelius Gallus (*Adversaria*, bk 41 ch. 26, p. 1862).
- 2 R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons, and R. G. M. Nisbet, ‘Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 69 (1979), 125–55. Of particular use in navigating the morass of publications on the ‘new’ Gallus are the commentaries of Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 263–8; and Hollis, *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c.60 B.C.–A.D. 20* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 241–52; and the monograph of Mario Capasso, *Il ritorno di Cornelio Gallo: il papiro di Qaşr Ibrîm venticinque anni dopo* (Naples: Graus, 2003); also Francis Cairns, *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), Ch. 3, esp. pp. 83–103, and *passim*.
- 3 On the distinctions between these terms see Irene Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 1–7.
- 4 In addition to the references given above, n. 2, consult J.-P. Boucher, *Gaius Cornelius Gallus* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966), Luciano Nicastrì, *Cornelio Gallo e l’elegia ellenistico-romana* (Naples: M. D’Auria, 1984), and Gian Enrico Manzoni, *Foroiulienensis poeta. Vita e poesia di Cornelio Gallo* (Milan: Vita e pensiero, 1995).

1 Six elegies ascribed to Cornelius Gallus

Maximianus

The Pomponio Gaurico who grieved the loss of Gallus in 1502 played a significant role in the creation of the Renaissance Gallus: he was responsible for the *editio princeps* of the *Cornelii Galli Fragmenta*, a book of six elegies and one short lyric poem ascribed to Cornelius Gallus.¹ Gallus, seldom mentioned in medieval literature,² became from this date onwards a prominent author of the classical canon.

The six elegies in Gaurico's edition are written from the point of view of an elderly man who laments the depredations of old age and dwells upon memories of the erotic disasters of his past. In the first and, at 292 lines, by far the longest of the poems, the persona writes of his brilliant youth at Rome and catalogues at some length the sufferings of old age. The second elegy concerns the persona's encounter with Lycoris, his former lover who now rejects and mocks him in his decrepitude. The third elegy marks a temporal shift, as the persona now begins to narrate shameful episodes from his past, in this case his thwarted love for a girl named Aquilina. The fourth poem narrates another shameful memory, that of the persona's love for Candida, which he inadvertently revealed to the girl's father by talking in his sleep. In Elegy 5 the persona has a disastrous sexual encounter with a 'Greek girl' which culminates in her singing a lament for his flaccid penis. A final short poem reflects on the inevitability of death.

The elegiac poems in Gaurico's edition were in fact the work of the sixth-century poet Maximianus (though both the dating and the name of this poet are not certain).³ The elegiac corpus of Maximianus had in fact already appeared in print, in two editions (Utrecht 1474 and Paris 1495). Both editions had attributed the elegiacs to Maximianus, 'a very famous philosopher and orator' ('philosophus atque orator clarissimus'), characterizing the work as 'a pleasant and most delightful ethical poem', 'a wonderful balm for young minds' ('ethica suavis et periocunda'; 'iuvenum quoque mirum in modum demulcens animos'). Post-Renaissance readers

often found it difficult to believe that Maximianus actually had been a school author considered appropriate for young readers, and so separated out our Maximianus from the 'Maximianus' who had been mentioned (and denigrated) by Alexandre de Villedieu in the thirteenth century. After all, as Giusto Fontanini noted in 1742, 'grammar books are handled by boys, disgusting elegies about love and drunkenness are not: of this kind are the elegies ascribed to Maximianus Etruscus, an old man completely corrupted by vice' ('quod puerorum manibus libri de arte grammatica teruntur, non turpissimae Elegiae de amoribus et ebrietate, cuiusmodi hae sunt, quae Maximianum Etruscum, vitiis inquinatissimum senem, auctorem habent').⁴ But Maximianus *had* been a school text in the Middle Ages.⁵

In any case, the fifteenth-century editions were a false dawn for the career of Maximianus in print, since from 1502, and in dozens of editions thereafter, the poems—Gaurico's edition divided the text into six separate elegies, a presentation maintained in most modern editions⁶—were always printed under the name of Cornelius Gallus. Even after their proper attribution had been noted—the ascription to Gallus had been doubted by Pietro Crinito in 1505, and Lilio Giraldi restored them to Maximianus in 1545—editors and printers preferred to maintain the fiction of attribution to Gallus, and Gaurico's text and paratexts were reproduced in numerous editions, under the title 'Cornelii Galli fragmenta', often printed together with the poems of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius. In such editions the name of Maximianus was usually passed over in silence.⁷ Even in the Gryphius 1573 edition (reprinting that of Christophe Plantin, Antwerp 1569), in which the editor Pulmannus (Theodore Poelmann) restored to the text a couplet naming 'Maximianus' and confessed in a sheepish prefatory note that the true author was not Gallus but Maximianus, nevertheless it was the name Cornelius Gallus, and not that of Maximianus, that appeared on the title page and on every verso in the running heads. Poelmann also incorporated printed marginal notes citing Giraldi's and Julius Caesar Scaliger's withering comments about the incompetency of the poet.⁸ But even by this point, it must have made better commercial sense to maintain the pretence, a pretence which continued in numerous editions into the seventeenth century and beyond. At the end of the eighteenth century Johann Christian Wernsdorf would complain bitterly that

in most of these editions [*viz* from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century] it is completely astonishing that even where the title of the elegies warns the reader that their true author is Maximianus, the book itself still has the same form and text as that of the fraudulent Gaurico, and not only continues to be prefaced by the life of Gallus

6 *Six elegies ascribed to Gallus*

written by Gaurico (which suppresses Maximianus's authorship), but also retains in the text all the other corruptions he introduced.⁹

However, although commercial inertia goes some way to explain the persistence of Gaurico's Gallus, this was not the whole story. Wernsdorf, again:

Although there were but few learned men who were openly taken in by Gaurico's deceit and seriously believed the elegies were by Cornelius Gallus, still one could find several who gave a little credence to that opinion, and embraced a middle view [*media sententia*] about their authorship.¹⁰

This *media sententia* is vital to understanding what became of Gallus in the Renaissance.

The identities of Cornelius Gallus and Maximianus had become fatally entangled, in spite of repeated attempts by scholars to unravel them. Their very names merged in the edition of Melchior Goldast, who published the text in 1610 under the name of 'Cornelius Maximianus Gallus Etruscus', apparently on the authority of Robertus Titius who claimed to have found this attribution in the manuscripts.¹¹ Actually, neither the attribution to Maximianus *ethicus*, the smooth and pleasant ('suavis et periocundus') school author, nor the attribution to Cornelius Gallus, the harsh ('durior') Roman elegist, seems to make sense of this text, nor do they give a clear idea of how it was actually read in the Renaissance, and what Renaissance readers found worthwhile in it. Indeed, the attribution of the text to the fictional hybrid 'Cornelius Maximianus Gallus Etruscus' may be a truer reflection of how it was read. The rest of this discussion is, in a sense, devoted to that Cornelius Maximianus Gallus—a name redolent of hybridity, self-contradiction, anachronism—and his peculiar fortune in the Renaissance.

Though Gaurico did not himself originate the attribution¹² (which relied on a text that omitted a couplet naming 'Maximianus' (4.25–6), and read 'Bobeti' for 'Boëti' at 3.48), he has for centuries been calumniated as the perpetrator of an extravagant and unexampled fraud. (Anger, after all, follows denial.) Let us ask, instead, what did Gaurico think he was doing? It is a question worth asking, since the attribution to Gallus of the poems of Maximianus, on the surface of it, makes absolutely no sense. What did Gaurico find in these poems that could make such an attribution acceptable? The straightforward answer is that he found an elegiac *puella* named 'Lycoris' (Gallus's beloved),¹³ a mention of a delegation to the East (taken to mean Egypt),¹⁴ and a persona who called himself 'Etruscus',¹⁵ and

characterized himself as a fine poet and orator in his youth, with a liking for drink;¹⁶ not to mention the attribution to Gallus attested in the manuscripts. But these are pretexts rather than a justification. The real reason is much more complex.

Read as a book of love elegies, the collection is bizarre: this is love elegy from the distorting perspective of a querulous and decrepit old man, who broods on the past, relives shameful memories of his youth, and feels shamefully compelled to persist with love and sex, but is let down by his repulsiveness to women and by his impotence. There is no parallel in the Augustan elegists for the elegiac persona as *senex*.¹⁷ How could these poems be the work of the first, and, so to speak, youngest, of the canonical Roman love elegists, who was, moreover, dead by the age of 43? Gaurico knew this, and in order to make Gallus as much of a *senex* as possible, hypothesized that this was the last of the four books of Gallus's elegies, written in Egypt shortly before his death.¹⁸ Biographical problems aside—and we ought not assume that Renaissance readers were insensitive to the distinction between author and poetic persona—how could these elegies, the work of the ‘last Roman elegist’, which underline so emphatically their secondariness and *lateness* with respect to the genre of love elegy, and thematize their status as an expression of a decadent age,¹⁹ be the work of the first Roman elegist, situated at the very start of the genre? How could these poems, in which the erotic disasters, the keenly felt shame and the painful memories of the persona have a distancing effect, rendering the elegiac genre itself impotent and no longer a viable means of poetic expression, be the work of the originator of that genre?

One answer is that this paradox, of the identification of last with first and late with early, is in a sense a paradox fundamental to the genre of love elegy; in another sense it is a characteristic paradox of Renaissance humanism. That short-lived and rapidly exhausted genre of Roman love elegy was ‘mature’ even from its very beginnings: from the start it positioned itself at an ironic distance from its own *topoi* and conventions, which from the start were treated as if they were already long-established—a disposition learned from their Alexandrian and neoteric models. Thus the self-consciousness of the Maximianus poems, which represent such a sustained ironic engagement with elegiac *topoi* and undermine the very principles of the genre, might be read as consistent with the character of classical Roman elegy itself. Furthermore, Roman love elegy, I would argue, appealed to the humanists of the Renaissance precisely because it offered them a sophisticated way to conceptualize their position as latecomers to the classical canon and, by imitating the techniques of the Roman elegists, to transform lateness into firstness, to make the false utterance into authentic truth.

For evidence that Gaurico himself read the ‘Gallus’ poems in this way, we must look to the elegiac poem he appended to his 1502 edition of Gallus (reprinted in his 1526 collected poems).

POMPONII GAURICI NEAPOLITANI
ELEGIACON.

Quid non longa dies: Quid non Cariosa vetustas.	
Quid non consumit tempus: & hora frequens?	
Heu ubi Palladiae divinum nomen Athenae?	
Heu ubi nunc thebae. Nunc ubi Troia manet?	
Sed quid ab externis: Propiora exempla petamus.	5
Ah ubi nunc mundi Maxima Roma caput?	
Proh dolor? Heu tantum furtim sibi vindicat hora?	
Heu furtim tantum vindicat hora sibi?	
Ut tam summa queat mutare: & vertere cuncta:	
Audax: & tantum perdere temptet opus?	10
Nec queror humani quod longa aetate labores	
Mortalique ruant maenia facta manu.	
Divinas vatum mentes: coelestia dona:	
Soeclorem [<i>sic</i>] culpa deperiisse queror.	
Ut iam praeteream graiorum damna: ubi nunc sunt	15
Quos olim innumeros Inclyta Roma tulit:	
Heu ubi nunc latitat qui scripsit Iasona Varro?	
Heu ubi nunc calabri musa verenda senis?	
Heu ubi ubi ille tuus premitur nunc vare thyestes?	
Atque Aruncani libera scripta viri?	20
Heu ubi peligni nunc est Medea Poetae?	
Dimidios fastos vix sua Roma legit:	
Heu ubi Pacuvius nunc est? aut Accius atrox?	
Heu ubi nunc Affranii est: Ceciliique toga?	
Heu periere omnes: Vix: tantum nomina Restant:	25
Ah quanta ingeniis facta ruina bonis?	
Ah scelus indignumque nefas: ubi Livius ingens?	
Historias decuit Roma perire tuas?	
Eloquar: a facinus: tua nunc ubi Galle lycoris?	
Ah ubi ubi ingenium Galle poeta tuum?	30
Poenitet heu longi: noctesque diesque laboris:	
Quum videam tantos deperiisse viros:	
Nitendum tamen est. Nam quamvis cuncta peribunt:	
Ingenii nunquam fama perire potest:	
Et quamvis tua scripta olim divine Poeta,	35
Ac versus tulerint saecula longa tuos:	

Orbe quidem toto vivet tua Galle lycoris:

Vivet & ingenium Galle Poeta tuum.

ELEGY BY POMPONIO GAURICO OF NAPLES

What do the long day and withering age not devour,
what time and the fleeting hour?

Ah, where is the divine name of Pallas Athene?

Ah, where now is Thebes? Where now stands Troy?

But why seek foreign examples? Let us look nearer to home: 5

Oh where now is greatest Rome, capital of the world?

What pain! Ah, can stealthy time claim so much?

Ah, can time claim so much by stealth?

That it can transform and overthrow the highest of all,
and dare attempt to destroy such great achievements? 10

I do not lament the destruction, from long age,

of human works, and walls built by mortal hands:

I lament that the divine souls of poets, gifts from heaven,
have perished by the fault of ages.

Let me pass over Greek losses: where now are 15
the numberless authors brilliant Rome once produced?

Ah, where now lies Varro who wrote a *Jason*?

Ah, where now is the venerable Muse of the old Calabrian [Ennius]?

Where o where is your *Thyestes* buried now, Varus [*sic* for Varius]?

And the unrestrained writings of the man from Aurunca [Lucilius]? 20

Ah, where now is the *Medea* of the Paelignian poet [Ovid]?

His own Rome has read scarcely half of his *Fasti*.

Ah, where now is Pacuvius? or dread Accius?

Ah, where now are the *comoediae togatae* of Afranius and Caecilius?

Alas, all have perished. Only their names barely survive: 25
such a ruin made of fine minds!

What a crime, a wicked shame! where is great Livy?

Was it right that your history should die too, Rome?

Could I say—what an outrage!—where your Lycoris is now, Gallus?

Where o where, poet Gallus, is your genius? 30

I rue the long toil of days and nights

when I see how such great men have perished.

But we must strive: for though all must die,

The fame of genius can never die;

and though the long centuries have taken your writings, 35
divine poet, and your verses,

Still your Lycoris, Gallus, will live throughout the whole world,

and your genius too will live, poet Gallus.

In elegiacs that self-consciously echo the language of the poems by ‘Gallus’,²⁰ Gaurico picks up on the wider implications of their lament for old age and the loss of youth, transforming it into a lament for the belatedness of Renaissance culture and the loss of the literature of the classical past. Thus: Maximianus’s personal lament for the loss of the Lycoris he once loved is here reframed as the world’s loss of the Lycoris Gallus once loved. Maximianus’s loss of his mental faculties and eloquence is here recast as the world’s loss of Gallus’s *ingenium* and his writings. Maximianus’s tragic clinging to his memories and his deluded hopes of recreating and reliving them become here Gaurico’s desperate expression of confidence in the persistence of collective memory (Gallus’s *fama*) and the disavowed hope that Gallus’s *scripta* now live again. That any such confidence is misplaced, that such hopes are deluded, is, we might say, betrayed by the very presence of the Maximianus intertext which fatally undermines—in more ways than one—their expression. Gaurico, in reading Maximianus as Gallus, thus shows a sensitivity to the subtext of Maximianus’s elegies and co-opts his late antique use of the elegiac discourse to express Renaissance preoccupations.

If Gaurico’s elegy proves rather ambivalent in its claim that his ‘Gallus’ really did represent a miraculous survival of the writings of Cornelius Gallus, a commendatory epigram by his friend Johannes Baptista Rhamnusius makes a more confident assertion:

Siquis sensus inest: Siqua est mens ulla sepultis:

Pomponi pietas haec tua grata satis.

Qui sparsos cineres proprio componis Acervo:

Qui titulum proprio restituis tumulo:

Ipse tuo tandem Gallus nunc munere: Gaudet

Se penitus dextra non cecidisse sua.

If there is any sense, any reason in the dead,
this act of devotion of yours, Pomponio, is well deserving.

You have gathered and piled up the scattered ashes,

And restored a name to its proper grave:

Now at last Gallus himself, by this service of yours, rejoices
that he did not die utterly by his own hand.

Rhamnusius makes reference to Gallus’s suicide and the *damnatio memoriae* that may have followed;²¹ and, like Gaurico, he transposes the language and imagery of Maximianus’s laments for the loss of youth and love into a commentary on the loss—and recovery—of Gallus. The idea of a partial life after death picks up on the final lines

of Maximianus (*Eleg.* 6); and the image of the gathered ashes recalls 2.29–30, where the image evokes a desperate need to rekindle the dead desires of youth.

A perception of the metapoetic function of the youth/age axis in Maximianus is central to these Renaissance attempts to read Maximianus as Gallus. In his ‘Cornelii Galli Vita’, which prefaces the 1502 edition, and was frequently reprinted in sixteenth-century editions of ‘Gallus’, Gaurico speculated that Gallus’s unfortunate encounter with the ‘Greek girl’ (*Eleg.* 5) had prompted him to write this book of elegies:

Materia satis oportune oblata est: Ut senectutis incommoda describens: Iuveniles suos amores recenseret. Seque suis carminibus: multo melius quam in Numo spectandum effingeret

This furnished him with suitable material to describe the ills of old age and to recount the love affairs of his youth; and to represent himself to public view in his poems to much better effect than on a coin.

The phrase *iuveniles suos amores recensere* has a significant double meaning: ‘to recount the love affairs of his youth’, but also ‘to revise his youthful *Amores*’. The verb ‘recenseo’ is commonly used of editorial or authorial revision, and the equivocation *amores/Amores* is frequent in classical elegy; moreover, Gaurico would have known from Servius (ad *Ecl.* 10.1) that *Amores* was the probable title of Gallus’s love elegies. Gaurico, then, seems to imagine there must be a relationship between this work of Gallus’s ‘old age’ and his earlier poetry, a hypothesis broadly consistent with the persona’s references to the poetry of his youth in *Eleg.* 1.

But more importantly, he recognized that the function of memory in the poems—the old man looking back on and recounting and rewriting his experiences, marked by the insistence on the verb ‘memorare’ and cognate words—is a way of figuring the relation between ‘late’ and ‘early’ elegy, and by extension, the vain attempts of a senescent age to access the authenticity and vigour of the golden age of Latin poetry. He must of course put this in terms of Gallus’s own life and oeuvre. But he has touched on something vital about how these poems function in relation to the canonical genre of love elegy.²²

The metapoetic function of the youth/age axis is most clearly in evidence at the start of Maximianus *Eleg.* 3, the point where the persona signals a change in perspective from the complaints of old age to a narrative of youth, which must be memorialized (*memorare*) in his poetry:

12 *Six elegies ascribed to Gallus*

Nunc operae pretium est quaedam memorare iuuentae
 atque senectutis pauca referre meae,
 quis lector mentem rerum uertigine fractam
 erigat et maestum noscere curet opus.
 Captus amore tuo demens, Aquilina, ferebar
 pallidus et tristis, captus amore tuo.²³

Now it is worthwhile to record something of my youth
 and say a few things about my old age,
 so the reader may steel his broken and disorientated mind
 and care to learn a sad story.
 Captivated by love for you, Aquilina, I went mad,
 pale and sad and captivated by love for you.

This shift from age to youth is marked as a shift to the proper domain of Roman love elegy, as lines 5–6, whose language is ostentatiously elegiac (‘captus amore’, ‘demens’, ‘pallidus’), make clear. *Eleg.* 3 thus holds out the promise of a return to elegy, but the elegiac situation, which at first seems characteristic enough—the young lovers, separated by guardians, can communicate with one another only by secretive, artful means, through gesture and glance (3.19–28)—will be undermined by the intervention of ‘Boethius’. His ruse, to corrupt the parents by bribery and so remove all obstacles to the persona’s desire, is in one sense a perfectly elegiac strategy;²⁴ but, I would argue, its function is also to corrupt the elegiac model, since it nullifies the elegiac situation. The removal of obstacles results in the removal of desire; *pudor* defeats *amor*, resulting in a sad, unsatisfied parting. The efforts of the persona to reconstruct an elegiac pose end in failure: the elegiac discourse itself proves to be no longer viable and starts to fragment.

Eleg. 2 also presents a distorted reconfiguration of the conventional elegiac situation.

En dilecta mihi nimium formosa Lycoris,
 cum qua mens eadem, res fuit una mihi,
 post multos quibus indiuisi uiuimus annos
 respuit amplexus, heu, pauefacta meos,
 iamque alios iuuenes aliosque requirit amores:
 me uocat inbellem decrepitumque senem,
 nec meminisse uolet transactae dulcia uitae
 nec quod me potius reddidit ipsa senem;
 immo etiam causas ingrata ac perfida fingit,
 ut spretus uitio iudicer esse meo. (2.1–10)

Behold the beautiful Lycoris, whom I loved too much,
 with whom I shared a soul and a life.
 After the many years we lived undivided,
 in dismay she rejected my embraces,
 and now seeks other young men and other lovers;
 she calls me a weak and decrepit old man,
 and wishes to forget the good times of our past life
 and that it was in fact she who made me old.
 Instead, ungrateful and faithless, she makes up claims
 to make people think that I was spurned through my own fault.

Here the obstacles conventionally placed in the way of the elegiac lover's desire (the harsh mistress, the physical and social barriers) are transposed to a temporal framework. The possibility of amorous fulfilment is now in the past, not in the future. The self-division that is the condition of the elegiac lover is reframed as a division between present and past selves, expressed in terms of the relationship with Lycoris²⁵: previously a perfect union ('cum qua mens eadem, res fuit una mihi', 2.2), now an irrevocable division, as Lycoris refuses even to remember their past ('nec meminisse uolet transactae dulcia uitae', 2.7). For the persona, even a memory of their past union could be enough ('Si modo non possum, quondam potuisse memento: / sit satis ut placeam me placuisse prius', 2.57–8); but we are not now in the domain of love elegy, and even poetry itself—the only hope of the elegiac lover—cannot bridge the divide, despite the desperate pleas of the persona ('Nec me adeo primis spoliauit floribus aetas: / en facio uersus et mea facta cano', 2.63–4). For Gaurico and the Renaissance readers of this text, the poignant desperation of this Gallus to recover his Lycoris through memory and song could express something of the late poet's yearning to reconnect with classical elegy itself.

The metapoetic reading of the collection suggested by the Gaurico elegy gains force when we take into account Gaurico's understanding of his 'Gallus' as a late revision of his youthful *Amores*. For example, the enumeration of the symptoms of old age in *Eleg.* 1 can be read precisely as a parodic recapitulation of the conventions of the youthful elegiac lover. Old age has transformed the markers of suffering elegiac love into grotesque parodies of themselves: the old man, like the elegiac lover, is thin and pale (1.133–6, 215–16), poor (181–2), suffers insomnia (250–1), has troubled dreams and hallucinations (252–3), and lacks sensual fulfilment (165ff.). In elegy the desired object is always held just out of reach: in *Eleg.* 1 the unattainable object of desire is not the elegiac *puella*, but the longed-for embrace of death (111–14). The *innamoramento*

is grotesquely transformed into the fall into old age (55–8). Moreover, the elderly persona of *Eleg.* 1 specifically laments his loss of *poetic* potency. In remembering the successful poetry of his youth, he characterizes it as fictions and lies (*'saepe poetarum mendacia dulcia finxi / et ueros titulos res mihi ficta dabat'*, 1.11–12). Contrary to Consolino,²⁶ who reads this as marking the youthful poetry as non-elegiac, I would stress that elegy is a discourse that makes a play of the intermingling of autobiography and fictionality (*'fallax opus'*); and indeed one hears in Maximianus's formulation at 1.9–12 an echo of some well-known lines of Ovid.²⁷ When the Maximianus persona laments that he no longer composes poems in his old age, he says *'non blanda poemata fingo'* (1.129), using an adjective associated with the genre of elegy (Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 379: *'blanda Elegia'*).

In *Eleg.* 1, however, the picture of the persona's lost youth does not quite equate to an image of the classical elegiac poet-lover: he characterizes himself as having been chaste rather than promiscuous, a desired object rather than the desiring subject. Paradoxically, in the elegies that follow, old age will bring the persona closer to elegiac love and sex, albeit in a distorted and parodic way.²⁸

Throughout the collection, then, engagements with elegiac models take the form of inversions, or markers of the persona's distance from the world of Roman love elegy: this version of elegy is a ludic reprise, a conscious fragmentation and restructuring of the discourse of classical love elegy. Consolino suggests that Maximianus's distortions and inversions of elegy relate to the fact that the ethical underpinnings of Augustan elegy are no longer viable in the sixth century (pp. 396–7). I would add that Maximianus's orientation towards Augustan elegy needs to be read also in purely literary terms: he is concerned with the question of what it means to write in the genre of love elegy at a time when its expressive potential has been exhausted. His collection thus reads as a sustained ironic commentary on the genre of Roman love elegy. Because this self-reflexive impulse to ironize the genre's own conventions and principles was present in classical elegy itself (an impulse having its fullest expression in Ovid),²⁹ Gaurico and others could find Maximianus plausible as the work of a 'late' Gallus—a Gallus situating his work as an ironic reprise of his early elegiac poetry. The long-lived Gallus could thus stand simultaneously at the very beginning and at the very end of the genre of classical Roman love elegy. Gaurico's notion of a Gallus revisiting and 'revising' (*recensere*) his youthful *Amores*, and his transposition of the language of the 'Gallus' elegies to a lament for a lost poetic heritage, work as a—perhaps inadvertently—sensitive reading of the metapoetic dimension of the Maximianus elegies, which are constituted as elegy

precisely inasmuch as they emphatically mark their status as a distorting and fragmenting reflection on the genre of elegy.

Notes

- 1 Not 1501 as is usually said. The edition is dated January 1501 *more veneto*, i.e. January 1502 (see *Le elegie di Massimiano*, ed. by Alessandro Franzoi (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2014), p. 56, n. 139). Pomponio Gaurico was the author of a work of some importance to historians of art, *De sculptura* (1504)—he was also a sculptor—and translator of Ammonius Hermiae: *Ammonius In Quinque voces Porphyrii* (1504). His *De arte poetica ad Franciscum Puccium Florentium* (before 1509) is a commentary of sorts on Horace's *Ars poetica*, mainly consisting of a categorized enumeration of Greek poets. His collected poems (elegies, *silvae*, eclogues and epigrams) were published in 1526.
- 2 Marek Thue Kretschmer, 'The Love Elegy in Medieval Latin Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, ed. by T. S. Thorsen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 288, n. 74.
- 3 The scholarly consensus is for a sixth-century dating, but Ratkowsitch argued for a Carolingian date (Christine Ratkowsitch, *Maximianus amat: zu Datierung und Interpretation des Elegikers Maximian* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986)). 'Maximianus' might be the name of a satirical persona rather than that of the poet: see, for instance, Christina Sandquist Öberg, *Versus Maximiani: der Elegienzyklus textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und neu interpretiert* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1999); and Brigitte Mauger-Pichon, 'Maximianus: un mystérieux poète', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 58.4 (1999), 369–87. I am grateful to Michael Reeve for providing me with a copy of the text of his forthcoming article on 'Maximianus' in the new edition of *Texts and Transmission*.
- 4 *Historiae litterariae aquilejensis libri V* (Rome, 1742), p. 50. All translations from Latin are my own.
- 5 On the medieval Maximianus *ethicus*, see e.g. Wolfgang Christian Schneider, *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian: eine letzte Widerrede gegen die neue christliche Zeit* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003), pp. 151–3; Anna Maria Wasyl, *Genres Rediscovered: Studies in Latin Miniature Epic, Love Elegy, and Epigram of the Romano-Barbaric Age* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2011), pp. 128–34; and David Richard Carlson, 'Gower's "Amans" and the Curricular Maximianus', *Studia Neophilologica*, 89.1 (2017), 67–80 (73).
- 6 See Schneider, 'Definition of Genre by Falsification: The False Attribution of the Maximianus Verses to Cornelius Gallus by Pomponius Gauricus and the "Definition" of Their Genre and Structure', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*, 129.4 (2001), 445–64. But cf. Spinazzè in Franzoi's edition (p. 58), who finds it 'poco convincente' that it was Gaurico's own innovation to impose the division into six elegies. Without pronouncing on the question of whether Maximianus's text should be treated as a continuous poem or as a collection of elegies, I will here treat the text as a book of six distinct elegies, since this is how Renaissance readers encountered it.

16 *Six elegies ascribed to Gallus*

- 7 Spinazzè, in Franzoi's edition (p. 62), counts 56 such editions between 1502 and 1794, only four of which (all four of them seventeenth-century editions) include Maximianus's name in the title.
- 8 The elder Scaliger in book VI of his *Poetices libri VII* had denied Gallan authorship both to the Lydia lyric and to the 'Aquilina' elegy, apparently the only one of Maximianus he knew (p. 852 in 1594 edn). Bernard de la Monnoye later took this to mean that Scaliger had believed the rest of Maximianus to be authentic Gallus, evidence of Scaliger's poor taste (*Menagiana* (Paris, 1715), I, p. 336).
- 9 'In plerisque autem hisce editionibus plane mirandum est, quamvis inscriptio Elegiarum de vero auctore Maximiano moneat, ipsum libellum tamen ad formam et recensionem Gaurici falsarii dari, et non solum vitam Galli a Gaurico scriptam, quae Maximiano abrogat, praeponi, sed etiam caeteras corruptiones in texto factas retineri.' Johann Christian Wernsdorf, *Poetae latini minores* (Helmstedt, 1794), vol. 6, p. 239.
- 10 'Etsi omnino pauci eruditorum fuerunt, qui fuco Gaurici se induci paterentur, et Elegias serio esse Corn. Galli crederent, quae erant Maximiani, inventi tamen nonnulli, qui non nihil concederent ei opinioni, et quodammodo mediam de auctore earum sententiam amplecterentur.' Wernsdorf, *Poetae latini minores*, vol. 6, p. 214.
- 11 When J. J. Scaliger had exposed Titius's error in attributing the text to Cornelius Gallus, Titius had tried to save face by asserting that Maximianus was named as Cornelius Gallus Maximianus in the manuscripts, so he was perfectly right to call him 'Cornelius Gallus'! (see Melchior Goldast (ed.) *Ovidii Nasonis Pelignensis Erotica Et Amatoria Opuscula* (Frankfurt, 1610), pp. 13–23). Titius may not have been lying about the manuscripts he had seen: the earliest MS containing the attribution to a merged 'Maximianus Gallus' appears to be Cod. 869 Biblioteca Casanatense (datable to before 1463), in which the copyist Lilius Castellanus noted in the margin to 4.26: 'Maximianus Gallus'. See Ursula Jaitner-Hahner, 'Maximian und der *fucus italicus*. Ein unbekannter Textzeuge', in *Litterae Medii Aevi. Festschrift für J. Autenrieth zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by M. Borgolte and H. Spilling (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988), pp. 277–92 (288).
- 12 The attribution is in eleven fifteenth-century manuscripts: see Spinazzè in Franzoi's edition, pp. 53–4; and Willy Schetter, *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik des Elegikers Maximian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970), pp. 70–4, who also observes that Gaurico was probably not the first to compile the arguments in favour of the attribution. Schneider, after Jaitner-Hahner (see above, n. 11), suggests that Lilius Castellanus could be the starting point of the attribution to Gallus (*Die elegischen Verse*, p. 157, n. 51). But, as Mariotti noted, the first attribution may have been earlier still, since Battista Dei in a poem from the first half of the fifteenth century mentions having read the works of Gallus (Scevola Mariotti, 'Cornelii Galli Hendecasyllabi', in *Scritti Medievali e Umanistici* (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1976), pp. 157–80).
- 13 Virgil, *Ecl.* 10; Propertius 2.34.91; Ovid, *Am.* 1.15.30, *AA* 3.537, *Tr.* 2.445; Martial 8.73.6.
- 14 Gallus was the first Prefect of Roman Egypt (and not a *Legatus*): Servius ad *Ecl.* 10.1 and Jerome, *Chronicon*.
- 15 The source for Gaurico's notion that Gallus was from Etruria might well have been Propertius 1.21; if Gaurico had read Beroaldo's Propertius

commentary (in print from 1487), he would have known that the Gallus dying in Etruria in that poem could not have been the poet Cornelius Gallus. Gaurico makes the claim in the ‘Cornelii Galli vita’ that prefaces his edition, but earlier in the same text he follows the traditional account of Gallus’s place of birth in calling him ‘Foroiulensis’.

- 16 Ovid *Tr.* 2.446.
- 17 On this point see e.g. Ian Fielding and James Uden, ‘Latin Elegy in the Old Age of the World: The Elegiac Corpus of Maximianus’, *Arethusa*, 43.3 (2010), 439–60 (440 and n. 2). On the *senex amator* in love elegy, see Hunter H. Gardner, *Gendering Time in Augustan Love Elegy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 220–1. Models beyond the genre of love elegy suggest themselves: one might think of the *senex amator* in Roman comedy, particularly Plautus, or of the portraits of love in old age in Horace’s *Odes*, or of elderly lovers in Roman satire (Juvenal 10.204–210). But the Roman elegists explicitly excluded the *senex* from the realm of elegiac love: see e.g. Ovid *Am.* 1.9.3 and Tibullus 1.1.71–2. Ovid’s impotency poem, *Am.* 3.7, is the obvious elegiac reference point for Maximianus 5, but with the crucial difference that in that poem the Ovidian persona is, emphatically, youthful: old age is seen as a threat in the distant future.
- 18 Giraldis, among others, was not convinced: ‘cum in iis neque phrasis nec tempus Gallo convenient, qui tertio et quadragesimo aetatis suae anno sua sibimet manu mortem sibi accersit, in iis autem se senem describit’ (*Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem* (Basel, 1545), p. 462).
- 19 Cf. Fielding and Uden, ‘Latin Elegy’, esp. 441–2.
- 20 Compare for example Gaurico’s opening couplet ‘Quid non longa dies: Quid non Cariosa vetustas. / Quid non consumit tempus: & hora frequens?’ with Max. *Eleg.* 2.17 (‘En, quid longa dies nunc affert’) and 2.23–4 (‘omnia secum / tempus praeteriens horaque summa trahit’). Gaurico’s phrasing here is based partly on Martial 9.49.9: ‘Quid non longa dies, quid non consumitis anni?’.
- 21 For the suicide see Suetonius, *Augustus* 66.2; Cassius Dio 53.23. More likely Rhamnusius was thinking of Ovid *Amores* 3.9.63–4. On the possibility of a *damnatio memoriae*, see Boucher, Jean-Paul, *Gaius Cornelius Gallus* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966), pp. 56–7.
- 22 On the relation of Maximianus’s elegies to classical elegy, see in particular Franca Ela Consolino, ‘Massimiano e le sorti dell’elegia latina’, in *Mutatio rerum: letteratura, filosofia, scienza tra tardo antico e altomedioevo: atti del convegno di studi* (Napoli, 25–26 novembre 1996), ed. by Maria Luisa Silvestre and Marisa Squillante (Naples: Città del sole, 1997), pp. 363–400; Jean Meyers, ‘La Figure du vieillard dans les “Élégies” de Maximien : autobiographie ou fiction?’, in *L’Ancienneté chez les anciens*, ed. by B. Bakhouché (Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier III, 2003), pp. 697–715; and Benjamin Goldlust, ‘Parcours narratif et parcours poétique dans les “Élégies” de Maximien’, *Revue des études latines*, 89 (2011), 154–73. On Maximianus’s engagements with Ovid in particular, see Fielding, *Transformations of Ovid in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 141–81.
- 23 3.1–6. All references to the text of Maximianus are to *Le elegie di Massimiano: testo, traduzione e commento*, ed. by Alessandro Franzoi (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2014). I use the conventional numbering of the elegies in place of the titles used in this edition.

18 *Six elegies ascribed to Gallus*

- 24 Cf. Fielding, *Transformations of Ovid*, p. 161.
- 25 Fielding, *Transformations of Ovid*, p. 153, n. 110, notes in passing the possibility of reading this Lycoris as ‘a personified Elegy grown to old age’.
- 26 ‘Massimiano e le sorti dell’elegia latina’, p. 375.
- 27 ‘Dum iuuenile decus, dum mens sensusque maneret, / orator toto clarus in orbe fui; / saepe poetarum mendacia dulcia finxi / et ueros titulos res mihi ficta dabat’, echoing Ovid’s ‘moverat ingenium totam cantata per Urbem / nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi’ (*Tr.* 4.10.59–60).
- 28 Cf. Juster’s observation that elegies 2, 3, 4 and 5 may be characterized as “‘antielegy’”—use of the forms and themes of the genre to satirize its assumptions’ (*The Elegies of Maximianus* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018), p. 167).
- 29 Brilliantly analysed by Gian Biagio Conte, ‘Love without Elegy: The *Remedia amoris* and the Logic of a Genre’, *Poetics Today*, 10.3 (1989), 441–69.

2 The reception of Gallus-Maximianus

In discussing the works attributed to Gallus, scholars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries tended to place excessive emphasis on the dissenting voices in humanist scholarship who denounced Gaurico's 'fraud' and denigrated the quality of the poems. They lined up a familiar roll-call of critics: Giraldi, who called the poems 'tralatitios et ementitos' (derivative and fabricated); Broukhusius, who, not to be outdone, called Maximianus 'barbarum, lutulentum, ac tantum non stercorem' (barbarous, impure, almost excremental); Goldast, who savagely attacked Gaurico for his 'fucus' (fraud), and demolished the case for the attribution point by point. But what was left out of these accounts was any sense of why the Gallus attribution lasted so long, and of what Renaissance readers found admirable or valuable in the work of 'Gallus'. That many readers in the Renaissance and after did value these poems is certain: innumerable works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries quote from Maximianus with unquestioned attribution to Cornelius Gallus. The recent criticism has also failed to tackle these questions, with discussions of the Renaissance phase of Maximianus's reception focusing primarily on the origins of the attribution to Gallus rather than on its legacy. Although Schneider correctly observes that the attribution led to a shift in the reception context, this line of thought has never been pursued, beyond a few cursory references to Montaigne and Milton.¹

It is not only that the attribution to Gallus shaped the reception of Maximianus: readers in the Renaissance and after developed their conception of Gallus through the distorting filter of the poems of Maximianus. Before the publication of Gaurico's edition, Poliziano had actually reconstructed a remarkably accurate picture of Gallus from the available evidence; but his notes remained unpublished.² After Gaurico, Gallus looked very different. For example, Petrus Ramus (Pierre de La Ramée), in his influential and much reprinted 1555 commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*, gave an account of the life of Gallus interweaving information

from ancient sources with numerous supporting quotations from the elegies of Maximianus, which he accepted as genuine Gallus. Ramus even revised the age of Gallus at his death on the basis of his reading of Maximianus, reasoning that he must have been an old man already when he died, and pretending that Crinito had said he died at the age of 63.³ By the early seventeenth century Kaspar von Barth knew better, but was toying with the idea that Maximianus was in some way derived from genuine Gallus: 'I have sometimes suspected [...] that many elements in these Elegies were copied from Gallus, but twisted to fit the meaning of this Maximianus.'⁴ The false attribution of the Maximianus elegies to Gallus had shaped the general conception of what Gallus's poetry was like, to the extent that it had become possible, even after the attribution had been debunked in erudite circles, to read him as a distorted version of genuine Gallus.

Many early modern readers admired the poetry of 'Gallus' (Maximianus) for its smoothness and fluency, its purity and its elegance: so the historian Enrico Palladio praised the elegies 'on account of their rather elegant style and their well-ordered ornamentation';⁵ Michele Foscarini (Fuscarenus) found them 'most charming, especially that elegiac poem on old age [Max. *Eleg.* 1]'.⁶ Johannes Petrus Lotichius, nephew of the elegist Petrus Lotichius Secundus, found Gallus (Maximianus) 'more agreeable' (*mollior*) than Tibullus and Propertius, comparing him stylistically to the 'easy, fluent and smooth' neo-Latin poets Eobanus Hessus and Fredericus Widebramus: his style is 'neat, pleasant and free-flowing like a river' ('tersa, suavis, et fluminis instar, molliter occursit').⁷ These stylistic judgements are in direct conflict with the familiar observation of Quintilian that Gallus was the 'harsh' elegist ('durior': *Inst. or.* 10.1.93), even if they could point to Ovid's 'quis poterit lecto durus discedere Gallo?' (*Rem. Am.* 765). Quintilian's 'durior', often taken to mean 'stylistically more difficult', could hardly be applied to Maximianus, whose elegiacs are straightforward and easy. Indeed, 'Gallus' emerges from these judgements resembling more closely Quintilian's Tibullus, 'tersus atque elegans'. Such conflicting judgements were inevitable as critics tried to align what they read under the name of Cornelius Gallus with what they thought Gallus *should* be like.

Other critics attempted to integrate Quintilian's 'durior' into their own assessments of Maximianus, by taking it as a more general remark rather than a specifically stylistic one. Sebastianus Foxius (Sebastián Fox Morcillo) merged Quintilian's judgement of the real Gallus with his own of Maximianus, glossing Quintilian's 'durior' with his own 'horridior' (perhaps 'ruder' or 'more uncouth'), and finding value in the poems in the reader's response to the portrayal of querulous old age.⁸ In

this reading, 'Gallus' is something like a satirist, making his readers recognize their own faults, perhaps in the manner of Horace as Persius described him (*Satires* 1.116–18).

René Rapin, who was mocked by Broukhusius and others for judging the poems of 'Gallus' superior to those of Catullus,⁹ opposed the 'mollesse' of Catullus to the more substantial poetry of 'Gallus' ('[le vers de] Cornelius Gallus est plus rond, et il se soutient mieux'). He was possibly influenced in this judgement, again, by the need to make sense of Quintilian's 'durior'; but he may also have had in mind Montaigne's well-known comment on Gallus's style: 'Gallus parle simplement, parce qu'il conçoit simplement' ('Gallus writes straightforwardly because his concepts are straightforward') (*Essais* 3.5). In making this observation Montaigne presumably had in mind the elegiacs of Maximianus, from which he quoted approvingly elsewhere in the *Essais*, all in the 1588 *couche*. The remark is made in the context of a passage in which Montaigne is talking about the sensual vigour of the best ancient poetry, particularly in talking about sex; and there follows a comparison with Horace, whose writing and concepts are said to be more complex. The contrast Montaigne draws between Gallus and Horace recalls Marc-Antoine Muret's remarks contrasting the styles of the elegists Tibullus and Propertius: 'illum [Tibullus] iudices simplicius scripsisse, quae cogitaret: hunc [Propertius] diligentius cogitasse, quid scriberet' ('You might say that Tibullus put his thoughts into writing with more simplicity, and that Propertius thought more carefully what to write').¹⁰ Just as Muret, in admiring Tibullus's simplicity, praised in Tibullus 'nativa quaedam et incorrupta Romani sermonis integritas', Montaigne's admiration for the 'simplicity' of Gallus-Maximianus, and the 'natural vigour' of a Virgil or a Lucretius, can be aligned with the wider Renaissance desire to make Gallus-Maximianus into the authentic first Roman elegist. The easiness of Maximianus's elegiacs, taken by other critics as proof of their decadent, late Latinity, here seems to be understood by Montaigne to be a guarantee of their authenticity as early works of classical Latinity: Gallus, as the first Roman elegist, was able to access a clarity and directness of expression unavailable to later poets.

Montaigne's notion that Gallus 'parle simplement', which does, on the surface of it, accurately characterize the straightforward Latin of Maximianus, appears to make no concession to Quintilian's 'durior'. But elsewhere (*Essais* 1.26) Montaigne wrote of his liking for a simple style in terms that could make sense of 'durior': his favoured 'simple speech' was 'nerveux', 'vehement et brusque', 'difficile', 'hardy', 'sol datesque'. Such a description has nothing to do with Maximianus's style, but could certainly be imagined to be appropriate in connection

with Gallus the soldier-poet. Likewise, the praise of sensual vigour in Virgil (*Aen.* 8.387–92, 404–6) and Lucretius (1.33–40) that precedes the mention of Gallus appears to have little to do with Maximianus, whose descriptions of sex are far removed from this, but could make sense in relation to the Gallus portrayed in *Eclogue* 10. Montaigne goes on to discuss how this vigour in classical poetry seems to be unachievable by ‘many of the French authors of our time’, and to lament that his own poetic compositions are characterized by sterile imitation: there is a thematic link to a later development in the same chapter, in which Montaigne discusses his own sexual impotence in old age. This connection might have been suggested to Montaigne by the impotency motif in Maximianus *Eleg.* 5, readable precisely as an expression of anxiety about the capacity of a ‘late’ poet to attain to the expressive vigour and potency of his classical models, with the ‘Greek girl’ (whose expertise in song is emphasized in the poem) representing something of this unachievable poetic potency.¹¹

Montaigne’s idea of what Gallus was like, then, was only in part a response to the elegiac verses of Maximianus he had read under the name of Gallus; it was also shaped by external notions of Gallus, elements of which may seem to us irreconcilable with the actual Latin poems that circulated under his name.

In mentioning Gallus in connection with the sensual vigour of the passages in Lucretius and Virgil, Montaigne may have had in mind not the elegiacs of Maximianus, but another pseudo-Gallan text that was almost always printed together with them in Renaissance editions of Gallus: *Lydia bella puella candida*. Before surveying the wider reception of Gaurico’s Gallus, we must consider it more closely, since it too played a major role in shaping the Renaissance conception of Gallus.

Notes

- 1 ‘Durch die Zuschreibung des Elegienwerks an Cornelius Gallus ergibt sich eine Verschiebung des Rezeptionskontexts’ in *Die elegischen Verse* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003), p. 158.. Schneider mostly relies on Ellis for his discussion of the Renaissance reception of Maximianus (R. Ellis, ‘On the Elegies of Maximianus’, *The American Journal of Philology*, 5 (1884), 1–15). Ellis’s identification (p. 4) of an echo of Maximianus 1.271–2 in Shakespeare’s Sonnet 19 is suggestive, but inconclusive. Agozzino (Maximianus, *Elegie* (Bologna: Silva Editore, 1970), pp. 15–23) remarks briefly on the Renaissance reception. Spinazzè in Franzoi’s edition (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2014), pp. 63–5, adds a few scattered observations. Joaquín Navarro López, ‘Aproximación a Cornelio Galo en el Renacimiento’, in *Congreso Internacional Sobre Humanismo y Renacimiento* (León: Universidad de León,

- 1998), vol. I, pp. 517–27, enumerates a few of the pseudo-Gallan works, but does not touch on their reception.
- 2 Helen Dixon, ‘Angelo Poliziano’s Unpublished Notes on Tibullus in Roma, Corsiniana, 50 F 37’, *Medioevo e Rinascimento*, 20.17 (2006), 245–84 (280–3).
- 3 pp. 122–4 in the 1558 Paris edition. Crinito in his *De poetis latinis* had in fact correctly written that Gallus had died at 43, following Jerome. That Ramus had read Crinito inattentively, if at all, is obvious from the fact that he overlooked the latter’s clearly stated view that the Maximianus poems were not by Gallus. Ramus was not the only one: Joseph Scaliger thought that Crinito had made the attribution to Gallus, and Vossius followed him in this error (see Wernsdorf, Johann Christian *Poetae latini minores*, (Helmstedt, 1782–1794), vol. 6, p. 266.).
- 4 ‘Suspiscatus sum aliquando [...] multa in his Elegiis esse ex Cn. Gallo descripta, sed in sensum huius Maximiani detorta’ (*Adversaria commentaria* (1624), bk 17 ch. 11, pp. 874–5).
- 5 ‘quae sane elegantiori stylo, et cultu verborum explicata, auctoris ingenium commendant’ (*Henrici Palladii ... Rerum Foroluliensium libri vndecim* (Udine, 1659), p. 75). Palladio refers here to ‘aliquae earum elegiae, quae eius [Galli] nomine circumferuntur’, which suggests that he had Maximianus in mind.
- 6 ‘lepidissima, praesertim carmen illud elegiacum de Senectute’ (*Honorii Dominici Caramella ... Museum illustriorum poetarum qui ad haec usque tempora latino carmine scripserunt, cum notis Michaelis Foscarenii* (Venice, 1651), p. 70). This and the previous example were cited by Fontanini, *Historia*, p. 47.
- 7 *Joh. Petri Lotichii Super poetis Latinis, nov-antiquis, censura, sive promul-sis critica* (Frankfurt, 1645). p. 39.
- 8 ‘Quibus [i.e. to Tibullus and Propertius] non est inferior in eo genere Cor. Gallus, sed durior, et horridior, ut senile aliquid in ipso, quod idem quoque deplorat, morosum adhuc agnoscas’ (‘Cornelius Gallus is not inferior to them in this genre, but he is harsher, and rougher, so that you even recognize in yourself something of the morose old man, a thing which he also deplores’) (*Sebastiani Foxii Morzilli Hispalensis De imitatione seu de informandi styli rationi Libri II* (Antwerp, 1554), pp. 42–3).
- 9 ‘Il nous est resté quelques Elegies de Catulle, de Mecenas, de Cornelius Gallus, qui sont d’une grande pureté, et d’une grande délicatesse: mais le vers de Catulle et de Mecenas est d’une trop grande mollesse, et d’une négligence trop affectée: celui de Cornelius Gallus est plus rond, et il se soutient mieux’ (*Réflexions sur la poétique d’Aristote et sur les ouvrages des poètes anciens et modernes* (Paris, 1674), p. 232). It is possible that Rapin was thinking of the Aldine elegiacs (on which see Chapter 5) rather than those of Maximianus.
- 10 *Sex. Propertius M. Antonii Mureti in eum scholia* (Venice, 1558), sig. A2^{r-v}.
- 11 See for example Fielding *Transformations of Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 174, who makes a link with A. R. Sharrock, ‘The Drooping Rose: Elegiac Failure in *Amores* 3.7’, *Ramus*, 24 (1995), 152–180. Thomas Gärtner usefully summarizes the conflicting interpretations of the figure of the ‘Greek girl’ and the impotency episode in modern criticism (‘Der letzte klassische Elegiker? Zur Deutung der erotischen Dichtungen Maximians’, *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft*, 7 (2004), 119–61 (146–53)). See also Ian Fielding, ‘A Greek

Source for Maximianus' Greek Girl: Late Latin Love Elegy and the Greek Anthology', in *Classics Renewed: Reception and Innovation in the Latin Poetry of Late Antiquity*, ed. by Scott McGill and Joseph Pucci (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2016), 323–39. Of some interest in this connection is Hannah Lavery, *The Impotency Poem from Ancient Latin to Restoration English Literature* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), in which, however, the emphasis is on the impotency motif as an instrument for political satire rather than metaliterary comment.

3 The ‘Carmen ad Lydiam’ (‘*Lydia bella puella candida*’)

Lydia bella puella candida, also known as the *Carmen ad Lydiam*, is a lyric of 25 lines in an unclassical metre sometimes identified as accental hendecasyllabics.¹ The metre is in fact rhythmic but not consistently hendecasyllabic, each line being composed of 10–12 syllables and four stresses. The persona first entreats the beloved Lydia to expose her body and offer a kiss, then, finding himself half-dead, begs her to conceal her charms.

Lydia bella puella, candida,	
Quae bene superas lac et lilium	
Albamque simul rosam rubidam,	
Aut expositum ebur Indicum,	
Pande, puella, pande capillulos	5
Flavos, lucentes ut aurum nitidum.	
Pande, puella, collum candidum	
Productum bene candidis humeris.	
Pande, puella, stellatos oculos	
Flexaque super nigra cilia.	10
Pande, puella, genas roseas,	
Perfusas rubro purpuræ Tyriae.	
Porrige labra, labra corallina,	
Da columbatim mitia basia,	
Sugis amentis partem animi,	15
Cor mihi penetrant haec tua basia.	
Quid mihi sugis vivum sanguinem?	
Conde papillas, conde gemipomas,	
Compresso lacte quae modo pullulant.	
Sinus expansa profert cinnama,	20
Undique surgunt ex te deliciae.	
Conde papillas, quae me sauciant	

Candore et luxu nivei pectoris.
 Saeva, non cernis, quod ego languo?
 Sic me destituis iam semimortuum?² 25

Lydia, bright and beautiful,
 Surpassing milk and the lily,
 and the rose both white and red,
 or polished Indian ivory.
 Show me, my girl, show me your blond hair, 5
 that shines like bright gold.
 Show me, my girl, show me your white neck,
 extending finely from your white shoulders.
 Show me, my girl, your starry eyes,
 and your curved black eyebrows. 10
 Show me, my girl, your rosy cheeks,
 suffused with the blush of Tyrian purple.
 Offer your lips, your coral-red lips;
 Give me soft kisses like a dove.
 You are sucking out part of my mad soul: 15
 These kisses of yours penetrate my heart.
 Why do you suck my vital blood?
 Cover your breasts, cover those twin apples
 that swell now with the milk they contain.
 Your bosom brings forth spreading scents of cinnamon; 20
 From you everywhere arise sensual delights.
 Cover your breasts, for they wound me
 with their whiteness, and the magnificence of your snow-white chest.
 Cruel girl, do you not see how I languish?
 Will you leave me here half-dead like this? 25

Its date of composition is not known: the widespread assumption that it was late antique or early medieval was challenged by Walther Ludwig, who dated it to the mid-fifteenth century.³ Indeed, the earliest MSS are from around that time, in the oldest of which (Bologna Univ. 3977 f. 69v, written in a hand dated by Augusto Campana to around 1450) it is signed 'per Galum poet[am]'.⁴ However, the unclassical metre of the poem, much more characteristic of a late antique or medieval composition than a fifteenth-century one, is hardly consistent with Ludwig's attribution to a humanist poet influenced by Pontano and Panormita. Indeed, the terms of the debate about the dating of the poem have not much advanced beyond its first airing in the early nineteenth century, when Barthold Georg Niebuhr, who favoured an early medieval date,

challenged August Ferdinand Naeke to find in support of his preferred late fifteenth-century dating an example of any poet of that time who had written in this way. Naeke could provide no such example.⁵

Lydia bella puella candida was printed together with the Maximianus elegies in Gaurico's 1502 edition, having already been paired with Maximianus and ascribed to Gallus in at least one fifteenth-century manuscript;⁶ it continued to be appended to the Maximianus elegies, always with attribution to Gallus, in the subsequent editions of *Galli fragmenta*. From a stylistic point of view, it was scarcely credible that this ersatz Catullan lyric could have issued from the same pen as the Maximianus elegiacs. But many Renaissance readers did indeed believe that both texts were by the same author, and that that author was Cornelius Gallus.

This belief could have found some justification in a close comparison of the two texts. It has not so far been noticed that the *Lydia* poem bears some striking similarities to a passage from Maximianus's first elegy (1.89–100), a passage popular for its description of female beauty, which was very frequently excerpted and imitated in the Middle Ages.⁷ Both texts enumerate the same features: black eyebrows ('nigra supercilia'—'super nigra cilia'), golden hair ('aurea caesaries'—'capillulos, / Flavos, lucentes ut aurum nitidum'), a complexion suffused with the colour of roses ('quae suffusa rubore/uernarent propriis ora serena rosis'—'genas roseas, / Perfusas rubro purpuræ Tyriæ'), red lips for kissing ('flammea [...] labra, / quae gustata mihi basia plena darent'—'labra corallina; / Da columbatim mitia basia'). Of course, none of these features is unconventional in descriptions of female beauty.⁸ But there is evidence that Renaissance readers recognized the similarities, and were able to elide the stylistic differences to conflate the two texts as the work of a single 'Gallus'. Joachim Du Bellay translated both texts (the only works of 'Gallus' translated by him)⁹ and in his translations—which appeared on the page consecutively under the heading 'Corn. Gall.' and then 'Le mesme auteur'—word choice and rhyme highlighted the similarities between them and smoothed out the differences. For example:

Car ie baisoys volontiers une bouche
 Qu'à plein baiser des deux levres on touche. (translating Max. *Eleg.*
 1.97–8)
 Et ceste coraline bouche,
 D'un long baiser la mienne touche. (translating *Ad Lydiam* 13–14)

These similarities must have bolstered the belief that both poems were by Gallus. Pomponio Gaurico, in presenting the Maximianus elegies as

the work of an elderly Gallus reviewing his youthful *amores*, possibly imagined *Lydia bella puella candida* (which he included in his 1502 edition) as a work of Gallus's youth: the similarities at Maximianus 1.89–100 could thus be read as echoes of the early poem, a reading made plausible by the fact that the Maximianus passage is part of a sequence in which the persona evokes memories of his tastes and desires as a young man.

Lydia bella puella candida was the most widely imitated of all the pseudo-Gallan poems. In neo-Latin poetry it was imitated by Poliziano, Marcantonio Aldegati, Francesco Molza, Giovanni Cotta, Johannes Secundus, Jean Salmon Macrin and Marc-Antoine Muret.¹⁰ It was translated into French, Spanish, and repeatedly into English.¹¹ It was imitated in the vernacular by Ronsard, Jean-Antoine de Baïf, and John Fletcher and, perhaps, Shakespeare.¹² Thus the Renaissance Gallus played a major part in the vogue for 'kiss' poetry, which was started in earnest by the neo-Catullan *Basia* of Johannes Secundus.¹³

Of course, not all of the poets who imitated *Ad Lydiam* necessarily thought they were imitating Cornelius Gallus. But some clearly did, and also took the Maximianus elegies to be the work of the same poet. Their pairing under the name of Gallus in the sixteenth-century editions led Renaissance readers to disregard the striking stylistic disparities between the two texts, and accept common authorship. Presumably they imagined Gallus as a poet more like the metrically varied Catullus than like Propertius, Tibullus or Ovid. But a few of the neo-Latin imitators (Aldegati, Cotta, Molza), perhaps motivated by the desire to make sense of the poem as a work of Gallus the first canonical elegist, transposed the lyric to an elegiac metre. Cotta, in his elegiac imitation, went further, substituting for 'Lydia' the name of Gallus's beloved 'Lycoris' (*Carmina* 7, 'Ad Lycorim'); similarly Molza (*Eleg.* 1.2, 'Ad Furniam')—who was also an occasional imitator of the elegiacs of Maximianus (e.g. in his epigram 'In venustam quandam puellam')—included his imitation of *Ad Lydiam* in a collection that also contains poems to a Lycoris.

The pairing of *Ad Lydiam* with the elegiacs of Maximianus in Gaurico's edition gave an extra dimension to Renaissance conceptions of Gallus: here was a more sensual and playful kind of poem to counterbalance the relentlessly negative view of love and sex found in Maximianus. It was naturally popular among readers and imitators enamoured of the lighter love poems of Catullus, in a period when the neo-Catullan vogue was at its height. Its accord both with contemporary tastes, and with expectations of what Gallus *should* be like, guaranteed its success; and it licensed readers to reimagine the poems of Maximianus in ways more consistent with these tastes and expectations.

Notes

- 1 E.g. by James Hankins, 'The Latin Poetry of Leonardo Bruni', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 39 (1990), 1–39 (22). But see H. Meyer, *Anthologia veterum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum* (Leipzig, 1835), vol. 2, 'Annotationes ad Tomum Secundum', pp. 30–2, for a detailed technical discussion of the metre; and Scevola Mariotti, 'Cornelii Galli hendecasyllabi', in *Scritti medievali e umanistici* (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1976), p. 161, n. 1.
- 2 Latin text from A. Riese, *Anthologia Latina, sive, Poesis Latinae supplementum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1869), vol. I, fasc. II, p. XLI (but retaining in line 3 the reading 'Albamque' for Riese's 'Album quae').
- 3 Walther Ludwig, 'Platons Kuß und seine Folgen', *Illinois Classical Studies*, 14.1/2 (1989), 435–47 (441–3). Ludwig thought it was possibly influenced by Pontano and Panormita, rather than the other way around. Mariotti found it more reminiscent of goliardic poetry (p. 158). See also Charles Fantazzi, 'The Style of Quattrocento Latin Love Poetry', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 3 (1996), 127–46 (136, n. 30). The poem may have been circulating as early as 1372, but the evidence for this is flimsy: a report that Jacopo Allegretti had found in that year 'plures endecasylabos C. Galli Forliviensis' (Mariotti, p. 160 with Hankins, 'The Latin Poetry', p. 22).
- 4 Mariotti, 'Cornelii Galli hendecasyllabi', pp. 158–9, n. 4. The earliest manuscripts (1450s) are Italian, and several of the later ones (last quarter of the fifteenth century) are German. A partial list can be found in Ludwig Bertalot, *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, ed. by P. O. Kristeller (Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1975), vol. II, pp. 333–354 (pp. 338–40). Since a full list of the manuscripts of *Lydia bella puella candida* has not previously been published, I list them here with the permission of Michael Reeve, who assembled this information. Augsburg Univ. II 1 f. 94; Cesena 29 sin. 19 f. 122; Basel Univ. F VIII 1 f. 166v; Berlin Lat. 2° 49 f. 131r, Lat. 4° 433 ff. 33v–34r, Diez C 4° 79 f. 56v; Bologna Univ. 3977 f. 69v; Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. S. 3553 f. 45; Escorial ç IV 21 f. 172v, ç IV 22 f. 165r; Florence Laur. 91 sup. 26, Laur. Ashb. 273 (197) f. 66, Ricc. 636 f. 15; Hamburg Philol. 126; London B. L. King's 28; Messina Univ. VII (14); Milan Ambros. G 10 sup. f. 68v; Modena Est. Lat. 134 ff. 63v–64r; Padua Sem. 141, f. 69v; Perugia Com. I 25 f. 19r; Prague Univ. XXIII F 106, ff. 108r–109r; Stuttgart Poet. et Philol. 4° 21 f. 44v; Rome Urb. Lat. 684 f. 143v; Venice Bibl. Civica 549, f. 176r; Vienna 3123 f. 168v; Wolfenbüttel Gud. Lat. 342.
- 5 B. G. Niebuhr, 'Ueber das Alter des Lieds Lydia Bella Puella', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Geschichte und Griechische Philosophie*, 3.1 (1829), 1–8; and, for Naeke's response to Niebuhr: *Augusti Ferdinandi Naekii Opuscula philologica* (Bonn, 1842), I, 318–19.
- 6 Willy Schetter, *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik des Elegikers Maximian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970), p. 72.
- 7 It is closely imitated in *Appendix Maximiani* 1 (combined with the passage at 5.25–30). See also Wolfgang Christian Schneider, *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian: eine letzte Widerrede gegen die neue christliche Zeit* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003), pp. 153–54, for uses of this passage in twelfth-century texts, including the *Alda* of William of Blois and the *Ars versificatoria* of Matthew of Vendôme.

- 8 See Alessandro Franzoi's commentary for Maximianus's models, Ovid *Amores* 3.3.5 in particular: 'candida candorem roseo suffusa rubore'.
- 9 Maximianus 1.79–100 and *Ad Lydiam* 5–14, done for Louis Le Roy's translation and commentary edition of Plato's *Symposium* (Paris, 1558), 191v–192r. More generally on Du Bellay's translations in this edition, see Elena Kazakova, 'Strategies of Unification in Joachim Du Bellay's Translations for Louis Le Roy', *MLN*, 126.4 (2011), 738–53.
- 10 Poliziano, *Odae* 8. Aldegati, *Elegiae* 53. Molza, *Elegiae* 1.2. Cotta, *Carmina* 7. Secundus, *Elegiae* 1.5.23ff. Salmon Macrin, *Carmina* 2.11 and later *Hymni* 1.35. Muret, *Epigrammata* 15. On the latter, see Leroux's note in Marc-Antoine Muret, *Juvenilia* (Geneva: Droz, 2009), pp. 432–3, n. 92.
- 11 'Cornelius Gallus to Lydia: An Anthology of English Translations and Imitations', *Translation and Literature*, 8.2 (1999), 237–251; Paolo Pintacuda, 'Una versione castigliana cinquecentesca del carne "Ad Lydiam"', in *Tradurre. Riflessioni e rifrazioni* (Bari: Graphis, 2008), pp. 199–212.
- 12 For Ronsard and Baïf, see Paul Laumonier, *Ronsard, poète lyrique* (Paris: Hachette, 1909), pp. 760–5. On the Fletcher/Shakespeare question see Alex Wong, *The Poetry of Kissing in Early Modern Europe: From the Catullan Revival to Secundus, Shakespeare and the English Cavaliers* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2017), pp. 257–60.
- 13 Wong, *The Poetry of Kissing*, esp. pp. 140–2, 198–9, 257–60.

4 From *senectus* to *amor*

Montaigne's ten quotations from 'Gallus' in the *Essais* all come from Maximianus's first elegy;¹ all of them date from 1588, and almost all relate to the pains of old age and more general ideas of collapse, disintegration and living death. But there is also in them a sense of the preciousness of sensuality and sex. Gallus was both a poet of old age and a poet of love.

Maximianus had been, before 1502, above all an authority on old age: the medieval *accessus* found in his work the exemplary *vituperatio senectutis*; the florilegia favoured his moral *sententiae* on old age.² Gabriele Zerbi in his *Gerontocomia* (1489), a medical treatise on old age, quoted almost 100 lines from Maximianus's first elegy.³ That poem continued to be cited as an authority on gerontology in medical texts almost two centuries later, but by this point it was under the name of Cornelius Gallus: the *Senum anatomicus* (1678) quotes extensively from 'Cornelius Gallus'. Robert Burton, in the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, cited 'Gallus' on the effects of male impotence. *Sententiae* from the poems of 'Cornelius Gallus' (Maximianus) also featured prominently in Renaissance compilations of a more general character, for example in various recensions of the *Polyanthea* and *Epithetorum opus* of Domenico Nani Mirabelli, in the *Dictionarium* of Calepino, in the *Sententiae veterum poetarum* of Georg Major, and in the compilations of Ravisius Textor. As in the Middle Ages, the Renaissance compilations tended to select lines relating to 'Senectus' and similar categories. Particularly quotable was the passage beginning 'diuersos diuersa iuuant' (1.103–10) on the different pursuits appropriate to different ages, quoted, for example, by Montaigne, and by Jean Amariton in his commentary on Horace's *Epistles*.⁴ But the attribution to Gallus, and the new association with *Ad Lydiam*, seem to have occasioned a shift in emphasis, so that Maximianus was now also an authority on love, his poetry a model for the expression of love and sensuality.⁵ In Ravisius Textor the lines quoted from 'Gallus' (i.e. from both Maximianus and from *Lydia bella puella candida*) relate primarily to descriptions of

female beauty and of love. In 1552 Petrus Godofredus (Pierre Godefroy) was quoting extensively from 'Cornelius Gallus' (Maximianus) to illustrate the effects of love in his *Dialogus de amoribus*, as, in 1623, was Jacques Ferrand in his *De la maladie de l'amour; ou melancholie erotique* (translated into English in 1640 as *Erotomania*).

The Renaissance Gallus could also be obscene. The association of Gallus with obscenity seems to have come about partly because humanists imagined his poetry to be similar to that of Catullus, partly because of certain details of his biography, and partly because Maximianus was indeed obscene. An imaginatively scurrilous poem by Leonardo Bruni, written in neo-Catullan hendecasyllabics, was briefly attributed to Gallus.⁶ More generally, the notion that his poetry was obscene was perhaps considered consistent with the idea of a bibulous Gallus who incurred the wrath of Augustus. Indeed, Marius Niger, in his 1518 commentary on Ovid's *Amores*, says that the reason the tenth eclogue survived Augustus's order to Virgil to remove praise of Gallus from the *Georgics* was as follows: 'Extremam autem Virgilii Eclogam, in qua Galli in turpi amore impatientia ostenditur, quod vituperationi potius quam laudi erat, noluit Augustus immutari' (36^r). The idea that the tenth eclogue could be read as a negative portrayal of a Gallus impatient to indulge his foul desires is not one that would find many adherents among modern critics. Obscenity also characterized works on Gallus inspired by Virgil rather than by any Gallus *pseudepigrapha*. Laelio Capilupi's 'Gallus' cento (Venice, 1543), composed of lines and half-lines from Virgil, on the model of the *Cento nuptialis* of Ausonius, stages a (successful) sexual encounter between 'Gallus' and his beloved.⁷ The decidedly less successful sexual encounter of Maximianus's fifth elegy also helped contribute to the idea of the obscene Gallus. The *libertin* compilation *Le Cabinet satirique* (1618) included a French poem largely translated from that elegy, 'Regrets d'une jeune courtisane grecque sur l'impuissance d'un vieux courtisan françois'.⁸ Gallus also seems to have been associated with heterodoxy and atheism: Leo X, 'that Epicurean Pope' as Robert Burton called him, liked 'Gallus', and supposedly quoted a line from him to resolve a debate on the question of the immortality of the soul ('Et redit in nihilum, quod fuit ante nihil' = Max. *Eleg.* 1.222).⁹

After the attribution to Gallus, Maximianus became endorsed as a model for Renaissance poets: they imitated him in a variety of contexts. Maximianus had been to some extent a viable model for humanist poets even before his transformation into the impeccably classical Gallus: Poliziano's *Sylva in Scabiem*, a work that draws on a wide range of Latin models both classical and non-classical, echoed Maximianus's descriptions of illness,¹⁰ and used the Maximianus intertext to draw out

a contrast between the past successes and present woes of the poetic persona.¹¹ Not all humanist poets shared Poliziano's liking for late Latin authors; but the Gallus attribution meant that the poems were more likely to be taken up by humanist imitators. Petrus Lotichius Secundus imitated 'Gallus' quite frequently in his elegies (1551–1553).¹² Marc-Antoine Muret imitated him in his epigrams (1552).¹³ Ronsard's contemporary commentator Remy Belleau identified in the former's *Second livre des amours* several instances of imitation of 'Gallus' (= Maximianus).¹⁴ Ronsard appears to have understood that the Maximianus poems he was reading were really Gallus ('Mais que me sert d'avoir tant leu Catulle / Ovide et Galle et Properce et Tibulle', 'Élégie à Cassandre', *Bocage* of 1553); but he had changed his mind about this by 1567, when he deleted Gallus from the roll-call of elegists he had read.

Gallus-Maximianus became a model for neo-Latin treatments of old age, particularly the *vituperatio senectutis*. Among the neo-Latin authors who drew on Maximianus in composing poems on this theme are Erasmus,¹⁵ Etienne Dolet (whose poem on the desirability of death in his 1538 *Carmina*¹⁶ recalls Maximianus's enumeration of the symptoms of old age to which death is preferable at 1.111ff.), and Germain Audebert d'Orléans (whose elegiac description of the ravages of old age, 'Ad Nicolaum Filium, ut eum ab Italiam revocaret' (1583), clearly draws on Max. *Eleg.* 1).¹⁷ It is harder to find more specific imitations of Maximianus's portrait of the aged *lover*. Satirical and paradoxical treatments of love in old age are of course frequent in neo-Latin poetry, but often draw more on misogynistic portrayals of aged women (such as Horace *Odes* 4.13 on the aged Lyce) than on Maximianus.¹⁸

Elegiac poems written in the persona of an elderly male lover are less common, naturally, since as argued above, the figure of the aged poet-lover is at odds with the discourse of love elegy. Nevertheless, Pontano wrote love elegies from the perspective of an elderly lover expressing his passion for 'Stella' (*Eridanus*). But the tone of those poems is quite far removed from that of Maximianus, with whose work Pontano does not seem to have engaged. The *Eridanus* dates from before the attribution in print of the Maximianus elegies to Gallus. Immediately after the publication of Gaurico's edition, another neo-Latin elegiac collection featuring an elderly lover persona shows 'Gallus' emerging as a model. This was the *Quattuor libri amorum secundum quattuor latera Germaniae* (1502) of Konrad Celtis.

Celtis frequently imitated the elegiacs of Maximianus in this collection,¹⁹ and it seems likely that he believed them to be the work of Gallus. In a passage at *Am.* 1.8.12–15 he combined elements from

Maximianus and from the *Carmen ad Lydiam*, suggesting that he thought of these works as being by a common author, or at least encountered them in a common source.²⁰ Although it is not certain that Celtis would have had access to Gaurico's edition when composing the *Amores* (which was published in 1502, with Gaurico's edition having appeared in January of that year), he may well have been aware of the attribution to Gallus in the fifteenth-century manuscripts.²¹ As early as 1486, Celtis had in his versification manual mentioned Gallus among those elegiac 'poets who ought to be read' (along with Ovid, Propertius, Tibullus and Catullus).²²

It was in book 4 of the *Amores*, devoted to the elegiac persona as *senex*, that Celtis imitated Maximianus most fully.²³ Celtis's *Amores* is a remarkable work, unique among Latin love elegy collections in that it maps the discourse of love elegy onto a complex four-fold schema charting the ages of man, the seasons and times of day, the humours, the elements, colours and astrological signs. Moreover, Celtis' elegiac persona's engagements with a series of 'barbarian' beloveds in the four books stand for the struggle of the neo-Latin poet to integrate the resistant present into a classical elegiac discourse. Like Gaurico, I would argue, Celtis saw in the elegies of Maximianus-Gallus a greater significance than the querulous reminiscences of an aged lover: the figure of the elderly elegiac lover in book 4 was expressive of the late poet's distance from the classical past and alienation from an authentic means of expression. *Amores* 4.3 and 4.4 are a 'Lament for old age' ('Deploratio senectutis') and a 'Praise of old age' ('Laus senectutis'). The pessimism of 4.3, which beyond the catalogue of the symptoms of old age also takes from Maximianus 1 a sense of isolation and the feeling of being out of synch with the world,²⁴ transforms, by the end of the fourth book and of the collection as a whole, into an optimism about the possibility of recovering the classical past and co-existing with the great poets of antiquity.²⁵

As in Gaurico's lament, in Celtis the pessimism of Maximianus is tempered by a sort of optimism inflected by his 'rediscovery' as Gallus. There is something particular to the Renaissance in this. Maximianus's elegies, in their late antique context, worked as reflections on the 'old age of the world': the persona's obsession with the memories of his youth and his own present state of decline and disintegration figured the death throes of a decadent literary culture doomed to repeat and rearrange fragments of memories of a now distant classical past. Renaissance authors found this aspect of Maximianus relevant to their own age, but the transformation of Maximianus into Gallus gave it new meaning, and reinvigorated its expressive potential.

Notes

- 1 In *Essais* 1.20 quoting 1.16; 2.2 quoting 1.47–8; 2.38 quoting 1.104–5; 3.5 quoting 1.125 and later 1.61 and 1.180; 3.12 quoting 1.277–8 and later 1.238; 3.13 quoting 1.155–6 with 1.247–8 and later 1.171–4. It must be noted that Montaigne nowhere explicitly attributes the quotations either to Gallus or Maximianus, which is of course consistent with his usual practice of omitting to name the sources of his Latin quotations. Schneider's argument that Montaigne was not in fact taking these to be lines by Gallus (*Die elegischen Verse von Maximian: eine letzte Widerrede gegen die neue christliche Zeit* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003), pp. 158–9) is implausible: Montaigne's remark on Gallus's writing in 3.5 (a chapter which also included three of the quotations) rather suggests that he did believe these quotations to be from Gallus.
- 2 Anna Maria Wasył, *Genres Rediscovered* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2011), pp. 122, 133–4; for the florilegia, Willy Schetter, *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik des Elegikers Maximian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970), pp. 7–8, 106–32.
- 3 Gabriele de Zerbis, *Gerontocomia: On the Care of the Aged*, ed. by L. R. Lind (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988).
- 4 Jean Amariton explicitly attributes the lines to Cornelius Gallus, and compares them to Horace, *Ep.* 2.2.55–7. Also on this passage of Amariton's commentary see Floris B. Verhaart, 'Horace and Ramist Dialectics', in *Transformations of the Classics via Early Modern Commentaries*, ed. by Karl A. E. Enenkel (Leiden: Brill, 2014), pp. 15–46 (p. 20).
- 5 Although NB Schneider (*Die elegischen Verse*, p. 156) observes already a fifteenth-century shift in the treatment of Maximianus as a moral author, before the attribution to Gallus was established.
- 6 Scevola Mariotti, 'Cornelii Galli Hendecasyllabi', in *Scritti medievali e umanistici* (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1976); see also James Hankins, 'The Latin Poetry of Leonardo Bruni', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 39 (1990), 20–7. Hankins concludes of the version attributed to Gallus that 'an imitation of Catullus [by Bruni] has been clumsily altered to pseudo-Gallus by a late fifteenth-century forger' (p. 23): e.g. the 'Aretine barber' was made into an Egyptian one.
- 7 G. H. Tucker, 'Erotisme, parodie, et l'art du centon dans le *Gallus* (1543; *Centones ex Virgilio*, 1555) de Lelio Capilupi', in *Syntagmatia: Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*, ed. by D. Sacré and J. Papy (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), pp. 329–43.
- 8 The poem has been attributed to Florent Chretien (Reformer and friend of Bèze), and dated by Pierre Louÿs—very insecurely, it must be said—to before 1568 (*Les Recueils Collectifs de Poesies Libres Et Satiriques*, ed. by F. Lachèvre (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1968), p. 538). Louÿs may be right that in making the persona into a 'French' ambassador, the poet was making a play on the attribution to 'Gallus'. But I think Louÿs must be wrong to imply that this translator was unaware of the true attribution, given that the poem locates the encounter with the 'Greek girl' unambiguously in Constantinople, the real setting of Maximianus's *Eleg.* 5. (The translated version has been transposed to a contemporary situation, the 'French ambassador' being

- part of a delegation to make peace with the 'Grand Seigneur', i.e. the Ottoman Sultan.)
- 9 Reported by Jacobus Colerus, *De animarum immortalitate* (Wittenberg, 1587), p. 4v.
 - 10 Stefano Carrai, 'Echi massimianeî nella "Sylva in scabîem" di Poliziano', *Interpres*, 8 (1988), 276–82.
 - 11 Tobias Leuker, *Angelo Poliziano, Dichter, Redner, Stratege: eine Analyse der 'Fabula di Orpheo' und ausgewählter lateinischer Werke des Florentiner Humanisten* (Stuttgart: de Gruyter, 1997), pp. 115–16.
 - 12 Pieter Burman the Younger identified numerous instances of imitation of Maximianus in the elegies of Lotichius (*Petri Lotichii Secundi solitariensis poemata omnia* (Amsterdam, 1754), vol. I).
 - 13 Marc-Antoine Muret, *Juvenilia*, ed. by Virginie Leroux (Geneva: Droz, 2009), p. 150.
 - 14 In the 1560 edition: fol. 38v (from the same passage translated by Du Bellay); fol. 40v; and fol. 43v (identifying Ronsard's model for 'Et ma langue debile vous nomme a tous les coups': 'Cornelius Gallus a fort bien touché cette passion', with 8 lines from Max. 4.27–34).
 - 15 See Juanita Feros Ruys, 'Medieval Latin Meditations on Old Age: Rhetoric, Autobiography, and Experience', in *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2007), pp. 171–200 (p. 198).
 - 16 'Ad Claudium Cotteraeum, expetendam esse mortem', in E. Dolet, *Carmina* (1538), ed. by Catherine Langlois-Pézeret (Geneva: Droz, 2009), pp. 292–7.
 - 17 *Germani Audeberti Aurelii Venetiae* (Venice, 1583), pp. 171–3.
 - 18 There are, though, perhaps some echoes of Maximianus *Eleg.* 1 in elegies on aged women such as Henri Estienne's 'Anus querela, de forma amissa' (*Moschi, Bionis, Theocriti, elegantissimorum poetarum Idyllia aliquot, ab Henrico Stephano Latina facta. Eiusdem carmina non diuersi ab illis argumenti* (Venice, 1555), fol. 92^r–97^r); or Scevole de Sainte Marthe's 'Amor vetulae' (*Poemata* (Poitiers, 1596), pp. 269–71). Noteworthy also is the thirteenth-century pseudo-Ovidian *De vetula*, printed several times in the Renaissance, a three book hexameter poem in which the 'old woman' of the title deceives Ovid into taking her as a lover. For paradoxical treatments of old age, see for example Caspar Dornavius, *Amphitheatrum sapientiae Socraticae ioco-seriae*, 2 vols (Hanau, 1619), II, pp. 304–5.
 - 19 See Thomas Gärtner, 'Der strukturelle Aufbau der "Amores" des Konrad Celtis vor dem Hintergrund antiker Vorbilder', in *Würzburger Humanismus*, ed. by Thomas Baier and Jochen Schultheiss, NeoLatina, 23 (Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 2015), pp. 37–45. Gärtner discerns structural as well as verbal and thematic imitation of Maximianus in the collection.
 - 20 This passage is discussed by Jörg Robert, *Konrad Celtis und das Projekt der deutschen Dichtung* (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2003), pp. 340–2. Robert does not recognize the *Ad Lydiam* source, suggesting other medieval sources for the elements of the description of female beauty not present in Maximianus. But Celtis' addition of 'siderei oculi', in particular, might well have been inspired by the 'stellatos oculos' of *Ad Lydiam*.
 - 21 As first suggested by Gärtner, 'Der strukturelle Aufbau', p. 40, n. 5.
 - 22 Celtis, *Ars versificandi et carminum* (Leipzig 1486), fol. 15^{r-v}.

- 23 Gärtner, 'Der strukturelle Aufbau', pinpoints 4.3 and 4.9 as imitating Maximianus 1 and 5 respectively.
- 24 E.g. 4.3.49–50 'Dissideo mecum probo nec mea tempora Celtis / Qualis sum nolo: nescio qualis eram' ('I, Celtis, am at odds with myself, and I am not satisfied with the times in which I live. I refuse that which I am: I know not what I was'), reworking Maximianus 1.5–6 (cf. Horace's *Odes* 4.1.3, Propertius 1.12.11–12 and Ovid *T.* 3.1.25–32). The Maximianus couplet ('non sum qui fueram: periit pars maxima nostri; / hoc quoque quod superest languor et horror habent') would later be imitated by Ugo Foscolo (who understood the lines to be by Gallus) in his famous sonnet 'Non son chi fui, per di di noi gran parte': see Spinazzè in Alessandro Franzoi's edition (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2014), p. 65.
- 25 'Sed nunc emeritae permensus tempora vitae / Orbe ego nunc alio tempora Celtis ago / Quo loca amena colunt Flaccus: Naso atque Tibullus / Sapho Propertius et Lesbia vatis amor' ('But now having traversed the time-span of my worn-out life, I, Celtis, now live out my time in another world, where Horace, Ovid, Tibullus, Sappho, Propertius, and Lesbia the poet's love, dwell in beautiful places').

5 Elegiacs attributed to Gallus in 1588 (*AL* 914–917)

Although Maximianus had a respectable run in the guise of Gallus before being unmasked once and for all, another Renaissance pseudo-Gallan poem enjoyed a more enduring success. This was the elegy ‘Non fuit Arsacidum tanti expugnare Seleucen’, first printed by the younger Aldus Manutius in 1588 together with three more elegiac fragments attributed to Gallus, wrongly named in the edition as Gaius Asinius Gallus, the son of Asinius Pollio—a persistent confusion originating in the *Vita Virgilii* of Aelius Donatus. The poems have for centuries been accepted either as genuine works of Gaius Cornelius Gallus or as the work of another ancient author, despite the damning judgement of Joseph Scaliger. Daniel Heinsius appears to have accepted Gallan authorship of ‘Non fuit Arsacidum’; Wernsdorf proposed a late antique author, possibly one familiar with genuine works of Gallus; Riese included the poems in his first edition of the *Anthologia Latina*; in 1836 their French translator Jean Genouille considered their authenticity as works of Gallus ‘très-probable’; and more recently Maria Salanitro has constructed a multifarious case in favour of attribution to Gallus.¹ In 2017 Boris Kayachev and Mikhail Shumilin shed more light on the poems’ textual history (by compiling for the first time evidence originally published by Chatelain, Körbler and Salanitro), but still attempted, in the face of this evidence, to make a case that they could be ancient. I aim to prove here that the Aldine elegiacs are a Renaissance forgery.

Debates about the authenticity of ‘Non fuit Arsacidum’ on the basis of internal evidence have focused mainly on its verbal parallels with various other texts, to some extent on its Latinity and metrical features, and on the points in it that Scaliger identified as blunders made by a composer ‘rerum veterum imperitus’, the most significant of them being the apparent anachronism in line 56 ‘Augusti Caesaris auspiciis’: Octavian would not assume this title until 27 BC, long after the supposed historical setting of the poem. Scaliger’s objections have been argued extensively on both

sides.² But a much more telling point has so far been ignored: that the Gallan elegiac persona in 'Non fuit Arsacidum' bears the unmistakable traces of a uniquely Renaissance version of Gallus, a version inflected by the attribution to him of the elegiacs of Maximianus. The persistence in Renaissance conceptions of Gallus of the decrepit but unkillable Maximianus (who, after all, had threatened in his final lines to rise again, zombie-like) contaminates and distorts the version of Gallus presented in the elegy, proving that it could not have been written before the sixteenth century.

Non fuit Arsacidum tanti expugnare Seleucen	
Itaque Ultori signa referre Iovi,	
Ut desiderio nostri curaque Lycoris	
Heu iaceat menses paene sepulta novem.	
Nec tantum morbus, quantum gravat ira parentis:	5
Sic premitur geminis una puella malis!	
Aequa tamen matris causa est: cupit illa, paternam	
Impleat ut pulchra filia prole domum.	
Quid, quod lena meos avertere tentat amores,	
Portat et occulto grandia dona sinu?	10
Et iuvenem laudat, qui munera misit, ab alta	
Indole	
Candida quod nulla lanugine vestiat ora,	
Quod fluat ex toto vertice flava coma,	
Quod citharae cantusque sciens; deinde horrida bella,	15
Atque ingrata notat tempora militiae.	
Me quoque iam canis narrat splendere capillis,	
Et quod . . . vulnere tardus eam.	
Multa quoque affingit, mentitur et omnia: fluxa	
Quam vereor ne sit nostra puella fide!	20
Femina natura varium et mutabile semper;	
Diligat ambiguum est oderit anne magis.	
Nil adeo medium	
Et tantum constans in levitate sua est.	
Filius Europae Minos, seu poneret arcum,	25
Sive comam premeret casside, pulcher erat.	
Non prius e muris pugnantem regia virgo	
Viderat, ac dirus crimina suasit Amor.	
Acer Amor deus est — foetas domat ille leaenas —:	
Excuset facinus vindice Scylla deo.	30
At pius aeternam servet ni Iuppiter urbem,	
Scilicet occiderat virginis illa dolo.	
[Sic pereat, patrias quicumque insanus in arces	

Mente ruit, poenas ut scelerata dedit!]	
Obruta virgo iacet: servat quoque nomina turris	35
Illa, triumphator Iuppiter unde tonat.	
Quid loquor ah demens! roseae nec flore iuventae	
Nec capitur missis lux mea muneribus!	
Non patris imperium, matris non aspera iussa	
Sollicitant: firmo pectore durat amor.	40
Non secus Aegaeo moles obiecta fragori:	
Illa manet; frustra ventus et aura furit.	
Nec minus, ut vires paullatim colligit ignis,	
Purior accenso fomite flamma micat.	
Illa meos reditus spe non praesumit inani	45
Et fovet in tacito gaudia certa sinu.	
Me vocat absentem, me me suspirat in unum	
Et de me noctes cogitat atque dies.	
Quin etiam argento puroque intexitur auro	
Altera iam castris parta lacerna meis.	50
Illic bellantum iuvenum studiosa figuras,	
Atque audita levi praelia pingit acu.	
Pingit et Euphratis currentes mollius undas	
Victrices aquilas sub duce Ventidio,	
Qui nunc Crassorum Manes, direptaque signa	55
Vindicat Augusti Caesaris auspicii.	
Parthe tumens animis et nostra clade superbe,	
Hic quoque Romano stratus ab hoste iaces!	
At mea cum primis victrix apparet imago,	
Exigit hoc pietas et bene fidus amor.	60
Ipsa quoque exprimitur deiecto pallida vultu:	
Stat lacrimans, et me paene vocare putes.	
Quam bene, cum ferrum nondum prodiret in auras,	
Omnia pacis erant, et sua cuique satis!	
Dives erat, si quis, parvi possessor agelli.	65
Severat ille prius, deinde coquebat holus.	
Non locus invidiae, quamvis vicinus habunde	
Et pecus et messes mustaque haberet ager.	
Liber Amor, nulli mulier suspecta marito,	
Casta satis, norat si qua negare palam.	70
Tunc Venus . . . spirabat dulciter ignes	
Spiculaque in silvis tuta vibrabat Amor.	
Cur mihi non illis nasci, mea vita, diebus	
Contigit? invidit quis bona tanta deus?	
O niveas luces! o tempora dulcia! vere	75

Aurea Saturni saecula fuere senis. Nunc ferrum erupit (rabiesque asperrima ferri), Nunc furor et caedes	
Forsan et hic noster tinget cruor hospitis arma Aut cadet unanimis frater ab ense meo.	80
Quid mihi cum bello? pugnent, quibus inclita regna Aut quibus . . . Marte petuntur opes. Nos alias pugnās aliis pugnemus in armis: Inflēt Amor lituos et fera signa canat. Fortis ad occasum nō pugnem solis ab ortu,	85
Detrahat ignavo protinus arma Venus. Sin cadat ex votis et res bene gesta feratur, Cesserit emerito cara puella mihi, Quam sinu, cui basia iungam, Dum lateri vires, nec sit amare pudor.	90
Tunc me vina iuvent nardo confusa rosisque Sertaque et unguentis sordida facta coma, Nec dominae pudeat gremio captare soporem Surgere nec media iam veniente die. Si quis amore vacans irriserit, imprecor illi, Ardeat et quid sit, discat, amare senex, Servus et ut nostros incassum laudet amores Et sapit hic dicat saucius igne novo. Heu male (crede mihi), si quis sua gaudia differt! Dum loquimur, nox est mortis et umbra subit.	95
	100

It was of no great worth to conquer Parthian Seleucia and bring back the Roman standards to Jupiter Ultor, while Lycoris, alas! for nine months has lain all but overwhelmed by grief and longing for me. She is oppressed not so much by this sickness as by her mother's wrath: one girl burdened by twin woes! But her mother has good reason: she wants her beautiful daughter to swell the family home with offspring. And what of that procuress who is attempting to lead my darling astray, bringing great gifts concealed on her person? She praises the youth who sent the presents, for his noble quality because no down covers his unblemished face, blond locks flow from his head, and he is skilled at playing and singing: then she denigrates terrible warfare, and the unpleasantness of military service.	5
	10
	15

She even says that my hair is brilliant white,
 and that . . . I move slowly from my wounds.
 She adds many falsehoods, and lies about everything.
 How I fear that my girl's devotion might waver! 20
 Women are naturally ever fickle and changeable;
 It is uncertain whether she loves me or hates me.
 Nothing in moderation
 And she is constant only in her fickleness.
 Minos, son of Europa, whether setting his bow 25
 or crowning his locks with a helmet, was handsome.
 As soon as the royal virgin saw him in battle from the city walls,
 dread Amor impelled her to criminal acts.
 Amor is a fierce god—he tames breeding lionesses—:
 Let Scylla excuse her crime with this god as her witness. 30
 If Jupiter in his benevolence had not saved the eternal city,
 it would have fallen by a virgin's ruse.
 May death come to all who madly attack their own country's citadels,
 just as that wicked girl paid the penalty!
 That virgin was struck down and is dead: and the tower 35
 from which triumphant Jupiter thunders now bears her name.
 What am I saying? have I lost my mind? My darling is not seduced
 by the flower of rosy youth or the gifts sent to her!
 Neither her father's authority nor her mother's cruel commands
 move her: love endures in her steadfast heart. 40
 Just like a rock exposed to the crashing Aegean:
 she stays firm; and the winds and gales rage in vain.
 Or just as when a fire gradually grows in intensity,
 the flame burns purer when kindling is added.
 She is confident that I will return, no vain hope, 45
 and she secretly cherishes in her breast the certainty of our joyful reunion.
 She calls out to me in my absence, she longs for me and only me,
 and she thinks about me day and night.
 She has now even made a new cloak for my campaign,
 woven with threads of silver and fine gold. 50
 On it she has fondly depicted in nimble needlework
 figures of fighting men, and battles she has heard about.
 She depicts also the gently flowing waters of the Euphrates,
 the conquering eagles under Ventidius's command,
 Ventidius who even now avenges Crassus's shade and our 55
 plundered standards, under the auspices of Augustus Caesar.
 You Parthian, swollen with pride, made arrogant by our loss,
 Here too, cast down by your Roman enemy, you lie fallen!

And an image of me victorious has pride of place:
This is what devotion and true love demand. 60
She herself is also portrayed, her face pale and downcast:
She stands by weeping, and you would almost think she is calling my name.
How good was the time, when iron had not yet been brought above ground,
peace held sway over all things, and men were satisfied with what they had!
Rich was the one who owned a small plot, 65
sowing vegetables and then cooking them.
No cause for envy, even if a neighbouring plot
abounded in flocks and crops and wine harvests.
Love was free, no husband suspected his wife;
A woman's public denial was enough to prove her chaste. 70
Then Venus . . . inspired sweet passions,
and in the woodland Amor shot his harmless darts.
Why was it not my fortune to be born in those days?
What god envied me such great favour?
Brilliant days! Lovely times! Truly 75
that was the golden age of old Saturn.
Now iron has burst forth (and the savage violence of iron),
Now madness and slaughter
And perhaps here my blood will stain a friend's weapon,
Or a like-minded brother will fall by my sword. 80
What have I to do with war? Let them fight who seek to obtain glorious power
or . . . wealth by war.
Let us instead fight different battles, bear different arms:
Let Amor blow the trumpet, and sound the raucous signal for battle.
If I do not fight bravely from dawn to dusk, 85
may Venus immediately take my arms from me for cowardice.
But if fortune favours my prayers, and my exploit is deemed a success,
Let my darling girl yield to me as I deserve.
Her to my breast, and I will add kisses,
as long as I have strength in my body, and there is no shame in loving. 90
Then let me enjoy wine mingled with nard and roses,
and garlands, and hair dirtied with unguents,
and feel no shame to long to sleep in the lap of my mistress,
and rise late as midday approaches.
If some loveless soul should mock, for him I wish this: 95
let him burn, and learn in old age what it is to love.
And thus enslaved let him praise, in vain, my devotion,
and, smitten by this new passion, admit 'He knows what's what'.
Believe me, it is a terrible thing for anyone to defer happiness!
As we speak, night falls, and the shadow of death is advancing. 100

The most noteworthy thing about this 'Gallus' elegy is that the persona makes more than one reference to his being perceived as a *senex*. In lines 11–18 a *lena* contrasts his white hair and physical debilitation with the flowing blond hair and talent for song of a younger suitor; and in line 95 the poet-lover wishes for those who mock him that they should find out for themselves what love is in old age.³ The first passage recalls 'Gallus' in Maximianus *Eleg.* 2.5–6 complaining that Lycoris has abandoned him in his old age for younger lovers, calling him a weak and decrepit old man; and the second more generally recalls Maximianus's evocation of the shame of loving in old age. As we have seen, it was widely known, and acknowledged even by Pomponio Gaurico himself, that the characterization of Gallus as a *senex* was a problem, since he had died by his own hand at the age of forty-three. The author of the Aldine elegy had another problem to contend with: that the elderly Gallus is flagrantly inconsistent with the historical setting of the poem, identified in the *argumentum* and in lines 53–8 as the Parthian campaign of Publius Ventidius (in 39/8 BC), at which time Gallus, according to Jerome's chronology, was in his early thirties. Why, then, did the composer of the poem insist on making the Gallus persona a *senex*? The answer can only be that this was a vestige of the Maximianus 'Gallus' persona. There was no precedent for the elegiac lover as *senex* in the canonical Roman elegists: indeed, the composer of the elegy seems intentionally to be wittily contradicting Ovid's line 'turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor.' (*Am.* 1.9.3), by merging the Maximianus *senex amator* persona with the Gallus soldier-lover persona.

The elegy bears other traces of Maximianus-Gallus. The mother's anger ('ira parentis'; 'matris ... aspera iussa') at her daughter's love for 'Gallus' causes the daughter to suffer a 'double woe' ('Sic premitur geminis una puella malis', 5–6), recalling Maximianus 3.17–18, where a mother's protectiveness also causes the daughter to suffer a double woe: 'illam tristissima mater/seruabat, tanti poena secunda mali'; and 3.33, where her mother's violent anger means that 'concupiunt geminum flagrantia corda furorem'. Moreover, in lines 7–8 the elegy makes a play of the impotence of the elderly Gallus persona (recalling the impotence of the elderly persona in Maximianus 5): 'but her mother's cause [of her anger] is fair: she wishes for her beautiful daughter to swell the paternal home with offspring'.⁴ On the surface, this wish is frustrated by the persona's absence at war. But in the context of the persona's characterisation as a *senex* in the following lines, and the *lena*'s attempts to get Lycoris to accept a younger lover, it may be understood that the cause is elderly impotence. This reading is strengthened by a witticism in line 4, playing on the reader's expectations: we first learn that Lycoris is out

of action for nine months, and assume she is pregnant;⁵ but her mother's anger is caused precisely by the fact that she is *not* pregnant, merely pining away for a *senex* who, it is implied, cannot make her pregnant. Here again, the characteristics of the Maximianus persona leave their trace on this composition.

Other echoes of Maximianus are present in the Aldine elegy (such as at lines 43–4, which have the same image of the flame burning brighter when kindling is added as Max. 3.31–2; or at 45–8, where Lycoris is imagined calling out to her absent lover and brooding on him day and night, recalling Max. 4.16–20),⁶ but we need not insist on them: of greater significance is the fact that the general idea of the Maximianus *senex amator* persona has inflected and distorted the version of Gallus presented here.

The Gallus of the Aldine elegy imagines his beloved embroidering a *lacerna* with battle scenes from the Parthian campaign in which he is fighting (49–60), in a passage recalling *Ciris* 29ff.⁷ The Parthian setting of the poem has over the centuries been judged by some as its most convincing element: the eighteenth-century translator François Catrou, for example, realized that the poem was not genuine Gallus but found it probable that Gallus really had fought in Ventidius' Parthian campaign, the setting (he conjectured) alluded to at Virgil *Eclogue* 10.44–5.⁸ It is a *piquant* coincidence that the Parthian setting of this poem anticipates interpretations of the Qaṣr Ibrîm lines, which Nisbet linked to an earlier Parthian campaign, the one planned by Julius Caesar in 44 BC. Certain passages in the Aldine elegy are surprisingly consistent with readings of the genuine fragment by modern scholars such as Merriam, who interprets the fragment's only complete quatrain as expressing the soldier-poet's wish for an end to wars, and compares it with Tibullus 1.10.⁹ The Aldine poet likewise connects the Gallus soldier persona with Tibullan contrasts of the military life and an imagined Golden Age and lover's paradise (lines 63–88 pick up on Tibullus 1.3, 1.10 and 2.3).¹⁰ The coincidence is, of course, entirely explicable, since our Gallus impersonator must have taken his cue from *Eclogue* 10, with the poetry of Tibullus suggesting itself as a suitable elegiac model to develop the idea. Merriam independently made the same connection in relation to the genuine fragment, a connection which had already suggested itself to critics before its discovery: the thematic link between *Ecl.* 10.44–5 and Tibullus had been noted by Ross, after Skutsch.¹¹

The Aldine poet's contrast of a present state of war and hardship with a past of peace and love is predominantly Tibullan, but the transformation of the elegiac persona into a *senex* means that it also functions as a recapitulation of the Maximianus structure contrasting the present

woes of age and the past pleasures of youth. In the final lines of the poem the Gallus persona, in terms that recall the poignant delusions of Maximianus, speaks of an old man's fantasy of young love without shame,¹² but quickly realizes that he is exposing himself to mockery for it (the *senex* is ever a figure of ridicule in Maximianus): 'Si quis amore vacans irriserit: imprecor illi: / Ardeat, et, quid sit, discat, amare senex' ('if some loveless soul should mock, please, let him burn, and learn in old age what it is to love'); or, in the 1594 text, 'discat ut exemplo quid sit amare meo/serus' ('let him learn from my example what it is to love/too late'). The elegy ends, like the final poem of Maximianus (albeit on a somewhat less fatalistic note), with an intimation of impending death.

In common with Gaurico's reading of Maximianus-Gallus, this elegiac *senex amator's* longing for a prelapsarian youthful love is here also expressive of a longing for the distant and unattainable classical past. This 'Gallus' laments 'Cur mihi non illis nasci, mea uita, diebus/Contigit?' (73–4), a suitably classical elegiac motif (cf. Tib. 1.10.11–12), but also, perhaps, an expression of a sense of belatedness on the part of the Renaissance impersonator of the classical poet. The sense of alienation from the present, of longing for a lost past or for an unattainable future, is in many ways fundamental to the genre of Roman love elegy. But the Renaissance poet, in merging the Tibullan model with Maximianus, makes the elegiac discourse expressive of something particular to his historical moment. And in fact, the real model for lines 73–4 is not to be found not in Tibullus, but in the elegies of the German Neo-Latin poet Petrus Lotichius Secundus (1553): 'Me miserum, quod non alio mihi tempore nasci/Contigit!' (Woe is me, that I did not happen to be born in another age!).¹³ Lotichius himself was in these lines clearly reworking Ovid *Met.* 10.334 'me miseram, quod non nasci mihi contigit illic'. This, along with the fact that the Lotichius poem predates by twenty-five years the 'discovery' of 'Non fuit Arsacidum', precludes the possibility that the influence was in the opposite direction. Lotichius's elegies, which frequently adopt the persona of a soldier-poet on active duty, and are thoroughly imbued with imitation of the Roman elegists, must have seemed an obviously appropriate model for our Gallus impersonator. Lotichius's *Eleg.* 2.2 ends on a similar note to 'Non fuit Arsacidum', its final couplet being a plea to enjoy the fleeting pleasures of life before the shadow of death falls.¹⁴

Notes

- 1 Heinsius in his notes on Silius Italicus quoted a distich from 'Non fuit Arsacidum' 'ex fragmentis Cornelii Galli non illis Maximiani' (*Silius Italicus De*

- secundo bello Punico* (Leiden, 1600), p. 346). Wernsdorf, *Poetae latini minores* (Helmstedt, 1782), vol. 3, pp. 129–30. Maria Salanitro, ‘Il “topos” “la donna è mobile” con ἀπροσδόκητον’, *Maia*, 60.2 (2008), 163–92; ‘L’elegia 914 R. e il carme 427 R2’, *Maia* 60.3 (2008), 408–10; and ‘Prove di autenticità dell’elegia 914 R. attribuita a Gallo’, *Maia* 63.1 (2011), 63–83.
- 2 See Salanitro (articles cited above) and Joaquín Navarro López, “Anthologia Latina” 914 Riese: Galo falsificado’, *Calamus Renascens* (2000), 247–58. Salanitro’s solution to the anachronism in line 56 is to read ‘augusti’, a qualifier rather than a *cognomen*. I note that Scaliger was wrong in his assertion that Octavian was named ‘Augustus’ by the Senate 16 years after the death of Gallus.
 - 3 Line number references are to the text printed in *Anthologia Latina* 914.
 - 4 Scaliger found this line ridiculous, since mothers of freedwomen, unlike noble mothers, did not have this kind of authority over their daughters. Scaliger was following Servius in identifying Gallus’s Lycoris with the freedwoman Cytheris (Volumnia).
 - 5 The variant *decem*, found in the earliest redaction, could convey the same meaning. Salanitro, ‘Prove di autenticità’, p. 63, mentions the Roman practice of reckoning human gestation at 10 months, counting inclusively. More relevant are Renaissance beliefs about gestation periods, of which Rabelais gives a detailed account in *Gargantua*, ch. 3 (which is semi-serious, but based on real legal and medical erudition), adducing numerous authorities to prove that pregnancies of up to 11 months were both possible and legitimate.
 - 6 Compare ‘Purior accenso fomite flamma micat’ with ‘ut solet adiecto crescere flamma rogo’; and ‘Et foveat in tacito gaudia certa sinu. / Me vocat absentem, me me suspirat in unum / Et de me noctes cogitat atque dies’ with ‘et coepi tacitus uulnera grata pati. / Singula uisa semel semper memorare libebat; / haerebant animo nocte dieque meo.’
 - 7 Franz Skutsch in 1901 (*Aus Vergils Fruehzeit* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901), pp. 137–9) noticed in the 1588 Aldine elegy some other verbal echoes of *Ciris*, which, together with the fact that the elegy contains an extended reference to Scylla and Minos, led him to conclude that the author of the elegy must have been aware of the attribution of *Ciris* to Gallus. The attribution of *Ciris* to Gallus was not widespread in the sixteenth century, but given that Barth and Taubmann, writing in the early seventeenth century, credited Obertus Gifanius (1534–1604) with the idea, it is quite possible that a Gallus impersonator in the late sixteenth century could have known of it.
 - 8 Virgil, *Les Œuvres, traduction nouvelle, avec des notes critiques et historiques* (1716), vol. 1, p. 294.
 - 9 C. U. Merriam, ‘The New Gallus Revisited’, *Latomus*, 49.2 (1990), 443–52 (448–9). See also James J. O’Hara, ‘War and the Sweet Life: The Gallus Fragment and the Text of Tibullus 1.10.11’, *The Classical Quarterly*, 55.1 (2005), 317–19.
 - 10 Tib. 1.3 for the sequence contrasting the military life with an imagined golden age; Tib. 1.10 for the wish to have been born in that past age; Tib. 2.3.77–8 for the vision of the pleasures of love in the past. See also Salanitro ‘Il “topos”’, p. 180 and ‘Prove di autenticità’, p. 78, whose argument in favour of inverting the direction of influence is unconvincing.
 - 11 David O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), p. 85.

- 12 In this fantasy, he imagines feeling no shame in rising at midday after a morning of pleasures ('surgere nec [sc. pudeat] media iam veniente die'), neatly inverting a line from Maximianus about a particular complaint of male old age, nocturia (1.256: 'cogor per mediam turbatus surgere noctem').
- 13 *Elegiarum liber II* (Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1553), 2.2.55–6.
- 14 Compare Lotichius 2.2.69–70 'Sic iuvat, et fas est, vitae quodcumque sequetur / Ducere, clam tacito mors venit atra pede' ('It is good and right thus to enjoy whatever remains of life: dark death comes secretly on silent feet') with lines 99–100 of the Aldine elegy: 'Heu male (crede mihi), si quis sua gaudia differt! / Dum loquimur, nox est mortis et umbra subit' ('Believe me, it is a terrible thing for anyone to defer happiness! / As we speak, night falls, and the shadow of death is advancing').

6 The forger of the 1588 elegiacs

Who forged the poem? Some tried to collar the younger Aldus Manutius himself for the crime.¹ But the three redactions of the poem all originated with one man: Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus (1517–1599), who had sent the text to Achilles Statius in 1578 and to Aldus Manutius the Younger in 1580 (Aldus waited until 1588 to publish it), who was the originator of a 1594 printed edition containing the poem, and who included the poem among his own *Elegiarum Libri Tres* in a manuscript poetry collection.² Kayachev and Shumilin compiled the evidence in their 2017 article, but argued that Didacus might still have been the discoverer, rather than the forger, of the elegy and the accompanying fragments. So far I have established that the elegy ‘Non fuit Arsacidum’ must have been the work of an impersonator influenced by the Renaissance version of Gallus. Now I will demonstrate that the poem was a deliberate forgery, and that Didacus Pyrrhus was the forger; and what is more, he was a forger who was trying to be caught.

The Jewish humanist and poet Didacus Pyrrhus (the Latinized version of his *marrano* name Diogo Pires), was born in Évora in 1517. Forced to leave Portugal in 1535, he lived an itinerant life which took him to the Low Countries, to Italy, and finally to Ragusa (now Dubrovnik), where he stayed for most of the last forty years of his life. He wrote Latin poetry throughout his time in Italy and Ragusa, sometimes using the pen name Jacobus Flavius Eborensis; his notable print publications include a book of *Carmina* (Ferrara, 1545), several encomiastic poems about the city of Ragusa and its noble families, and a large poetic collection called the *Cato minor* (Venice, 1592; 2nd edn. 1596).³

Didacus was an accomplished writer of elegiac poems in the manner of Tibullus and Propertius: Michael de Sörgo (Miho Sorkočević) in 1790 thought that Didacus’s elegies exhibited a genuine Tibullan style (‘germanum Tibulli stylum’), and Tommaso Chersa in 1826 found the elegiacs of Didacus comparable to those of Tibullus and Propertius, and counted them among the

finest neo-Latin elegies ('se fosro conosciute, sarebbono paragonate a quelle di Tibullo e di Propertio, e nulla al fermo perderebbono messe a fronte con le migliori cose degli Elegiaci del sedicesimo secolo e del diciottesimo, contanto fecondi di ottimi poemi in siffato genere').⁴ Both critics perhaps exaggerated their praise of Didacus's elegies, motivated as they were by Ragusan patriotism; but it is nonetheless clear that Didacus was a sufficiently accomplished elegiac poet to have written the Aldine elegy, which is clearly the work of a devotee of Propertius and, above all, Tibullus.

As we have seen, the composer of the elegy took the unusual decision to make the Gallus persona into a Maximianus-like *senex*. Didacus Pyrrhus, himself an old man by 1578, also composed love elegies in his own name from the perspective of an elderly *amator*. In his *Elegiarum libri tres*, elegy 1.2 is written in the persona of an elderly lover subject to the mockery of his beloved, like Maximianus in *Eleg.* 2:

At fugis et rides et me ceu vana loquentem
Reicis et post te claudis honesta fores.⁵

But you avoid me and laugh at me and scorn me as if my words were meaningless, and virtuously shut the door behind you.

That Didacus found it possible to write love elegies from the perspective of an old man, despite the absence of a model for this in classical poetry, is not in itself conclusive: as we have seen, previous neo-Latin love elegists such as Pontano and Celtis had done so. What is needed is a proof that Didacus thought it would be appropriate for Gallus to adopt the persona of an elegiac lover who was a *senex*. After all, the Maximianus attribution had been widely debunked by 1578, so that not every prospective impersonator of Gallus would have had this idea of him. Such a proof is provided in Didacus's own poetry. Didacus was the author of an epigram which shows that his understanding of Gallus was conditioned by the Gallus of Gaurico (which, recall, attributed both the Maximianus elegies and the *Carmen ad Lydiam* to Gallus, repeated in numerous editions thereafter).

Qui sanguisugam parvulum insectum vocat
Galli Lycorin rectius vocaverit.
Namque ut petenti basium dedit seni,
Hirudo qualis e lacunis Africae
Sugit misello puriorem sanguinem.⁶

Anyone who calls that little creature a 'bloodsucker'
Would be more correct if he called it by the name of Gallus's Lycoris.

For when she gave the kiss the old man wanted,
Like a leech from the ponds of Africa
She sucked pure blood from the poor man.

The distinctive reference to the bloodsucking kiss is clearly an allusion to *Ad Lydiam*.⁷ But Didacus here merges the 'Gallus' of *Ad Lydiam* with the 'Gallus' of the Maximianus elegies. In common with earlier neo-Latin imitators of *Ad Lydiam*, he substitutes the name 'Lycoris' for 'Lydia'.⁸ More tellingly, he makes Gallus into a *senex*. Clearly Didacus's idea of Cornelius Gallus depended on a conflation of Maximianus-Gallus with the 'Gallus' of the *Carmen ad Lydiam*.

Didacus inherits a conception of Gallus already shot through with dissonances and contradictions: the Maximianus and Lydia poems are clearly irreconcilable as the work of the same author both stylistically and thematically, even before attempting to reconcile them with the Gallus of literary history. The reasons why the Renaissance assimilated such dissonances into its conception of Gallus have been touched on above; Didacus carried these contradictions over into his new version of Gallus.

Kayachev and Shumilin, picking up on points first made by Körbler and Novakovic, noted that there are many similarities between the Aldine 'Gallus' poems and Didacus's own Latin poetry: these range from the reproduction of half-lines and *clausulae* to the replication of multiple lines at a time. The similarities are in fact more numerous than the ones listed by them. Since arguments for the priority of one or another text from verbal similarities between them are almost always reversible, I will refrain from enumerating them at length here. There is, in any case, no reason to accept Kayachev and Shumilin's argument that the existence of these similarities favours the priority of the 'Gallus' poems, an argument which depends on the hypothesis that Didacus knew them as early as 1545: it stretches credulity to imagine that Didacus had decided to keep silent about his amazing discovery until 1578, all the while mining the poems for material for his own compositions. It is far more reasonable to conclude that the similarities are simply evidence of common authorship: Didacus frequently reused his own lines and formulations, common practice among neo-Latin poets.

Beyond the many verbal similarities with the poetic works published by Didacus under his own name, there is a further indication of Didacus's authorship of the Aldine elegiacs in the epigram *AL916*. Didacus described the two sisters in the poem as camp-following courtesans from Illyria (hence the mention of 'Illyricos ... rates' in the poem), an interpretation he attributed to 'Gaza'.⁹ That Illyria should feature in this Gallus fragment supposedly 'discovered' in a monastery in Ghent (as

was claimed in the 1594 edition) is a striking coincidence, since it was, of course, the location of Ragusa, Didacus's own adopted homeland, frequently celebrated by him in his poetry.

Why, then, did Didacus not conceal his tracks more carefully? Mere incompetency? Joseph Scaliger clearly thought so: 'Profecto, mi Gru-tere, si nostrum esset mentiri, illud pudentius et cautius faceremus, neque tam imprudenter, ut in ipso vestibulo fucus pateret' ('to be sure, my dear Gruyter, if I made it my business to deceive I would do so more modestly and carefully, and not so imprudently as to make the fraud obvious right from the very start').¹⁰ The forger did indeed make the fraud obvious, but, I will argue, he did so not from incompetency. Irene Peirano has made an important contribution to our understanding of ancient and late ancient Roman fakes and the different contexts and motivations that might produce them.¹¹ A further dimension to ancient fakes composed by Renaissance humanists was that they were often done to test the critical acumen of their fellow scholars: Chatelain gives the example of Muret trying to fool Scaliger with his forgeries of Trabea and Accius, a particularly apposite example in this case, as we shall see. Such fakery could be malicious, but it could also be undertaken in a spirit of fun, as a game in which the opposition must be given a sporting chance. Muret presented his own hoax as having been done 'for the sake of amusement' ('animi causa') and 'as a joke' ('per iocum')—although there was rather more malice in it than he admitted.

In 1578 an anonymous correspondent claiming to be in Thessaloniki had sent 'Non fuit Arsacidum' together with two of the epigrams to the Portuguese humanist Achilles Statius.¹² The writer coyly withheld his name (offering only, in a follow-up letter, the pseudonym 'Proculus Philiponus', evocative of his sufferings in exile), but let slip just enough information to allow the addressee to identify him: he described himself as elderly, an exile, and an old acquaintance and fellow countryman of Achilles Statius. That the sender was Didacus Pyrrhus himself is now beyond doubt.¹³ The two 1578 letters he sent to Achilles Statius are deliberately provocative: in particular, he urged Statius to pronounce on whether he thought the elegiacs were genuine or a fake ('Quod vero de illa tuum sit iudicium, supposititium, an legitimum partum existimes, vellem ut perscribas'). It would not have been unknown to Didacus that in 1567 Statius had been the victim of—or, as some suspected, had himself perpetrated—a hoax, when he published a forged poem, 'Orpheus', purporting to be the work of Cassius of Parma. Incidentally, Pithou in 1590 suggested that the younger Aldus—to whom Didacus sent his Gallus elegiacs in 1580¹⁴—had also been taken in by the 'Orpheus' hoax:

tamen non nisi Aldi ipsius fide Corn. Galli titulo hic adiici voluimus, salva criticis non de his modo sed et de reliquis, vel de Cassii Parmensis Eidyllio sententia sua.

(but we chose here to include [the 1588 Gallus elegiacs] under the heading of Cornelius Gallus only on the word of Aldus himself, leaving critics free to form their own opinion not only of these verses but of the others, in particular the Idyll of Cassius of Parma).¹⁵

It seems to be no coincidence that Didacus chose to send the Gallus elegiacs first to Achilles Statius and then to Aldus.

A further provocation came in 1594 when a second edition of the Gallus elegiacs appeared in print, almost certainly at the initiation of Didacus himself: according to Augusto Campana,¹⁶ Didacus actually sent a copy of this 1594 edition—the copy is now lost—to Aldus Manutius the Younger, with a manuscript dedication: a taunt, or a proof of complicity? This edition was substantially different from the 1588 Aldine, and not only in the text of the Gallus poems themselves. A prefatory note included the following:

Libuit has duas elegias dissimili argumento et diversis temporibus conscriptas una edere, ut aetatis nostrae adolescentes pari fere utriusque elegantia perspecta animos erigant et illustri aemulatione ad poetica studia inflammentur. [...] Alterius elegiae argumentum recens est et, qui scripsit, superest hodie, eruditorum tamen iudicia exploraturus de industria latet.

We have gladly chosen to publish these two elegies together, though they have different subjects and were composed in different times, so that young men of our era, in appreciating the almost equal elegance of both, may rouse their wits and be spurred on by the great spirit of emulation to the study of poetry [...] The subject of the second elegy is recent, and its author is still alive, but he is intentionally concealing his identity in order to put to the test the judgements of learned men.

The 'two elegies' mentioned here are 'Non fuit Arsacidum' (now titled, with calculated ambiguity, 'Elegia I sub nomine Galli veteris poetae edita') and an elegy 'In obitum Joannae Hetruriae Reginae'.¹⁷ The latter is by none other than Didacus Pyrrhus. Kayachev and Shumilin are quite wrong to assert that Didacus in the 1594 edition and in the

Elegiarum libri III ‘continues to ascribe the elegy on the death of Joanna of Austria to a poet other than himself’ (p. 208, my emphasis), and to conclude that the Joanna elegy is not by Didacus: in fact in 1578 (the year of its composition and of the death of Joanna), when he had sent it to Achilles Statius, Didacus had claimed authorship of the poem in the postscript to the second letter: ‘Accipies cum his *carmen nostrum* in obitum Joannae Etruriae reginae’. Clearly the attribution in 1594 and in his own *Elegiarum libri tres* to another contemporary author was merely part of the ludic mystification designed to ‘test the judgements of learned men’ (‘eruditorum ... iudicia exploraturus’). Significantly, Muret in 1575 had used a very similar expression when he admitted to his forgery of poems by Trabea and Accius: he had done it, he said, ‘to test the judgements of others’ (‘ut experirer aliorum iudicia’).¹⁸ The clues were there: Didacus wanted to see if the experts would pick up on them. The two elegies were by the same author: what other reason could there be for printing them together in the 1594 edition, except as a provocation, a test? It is telling that the prefatory note pairs the two elegies, saying that although they were supposedly written at different times and by different authors, they demonstrate ‘almost equal elegance’. Didacus wanted his forgery to be exposed, so that he could get the credit he felt he deserved.

Here, then, is the explanation for the otherwise inexplicable decision to publish the Gallus elegiacs in 1594 in jarring combination with an unrelated neo-Latin elegy. The 1594 presentation of the poems concedes that they have nothing in common in subject matter, but begs the reader to perceive similarities between them at the level of style (their ‘almost equal elegance’). Indeed, a motivated reader intent on comparison—the kind of reader the prefatory note invites—might find some informative echoes between them. Both ‘Non fuit Arsacidum’ and the Joanna elegy begin with the mention of a nine-month period and a woman’s suffering,¹⁹ and although the situations are very different—an elegiac *puella*’s illness and oppression by her mother, as opposed to Joanna’s death in childbirth—the pregnancy motif of the latter resonates with the reading of the former I proposed above. Furthermore, the use of the word ‘Augusti’ (56) in the Gallus elegy—the most glaring proof of its inauthenticity—finds a parallel in the Joanna elegy, where the word ‘augusta’ (22) occurs in the same metrical *sedes* of the pentameter.²⁰ Could it be that the recurrence of the word in the Joanna elegy is there to highlight for an attentive reader the single most telling anachronism in the Gallus elegy? If so, the anachronism must not be taken as evidence of an inept forger, but as something more akin to the ‘self-conscious anachronism’ that Peirano discusses in relation to the ludic

dimension of ancient fakes.²¹ We could go further, and suggest that the anachronisms and historical errors in 'Non fuit Arsacidum' are clues to alert the reader to the paradox of a Gallus who is both young and old at the same time, a paradox brought about by the merging of the 'late' Gallus (Maximianus) with the 'early' Gallus persona. Körbler suggested that Lilio Giraldis (Didacus's friend, and one of the first to pronounce on the inauthenticity of Maximianus-Gallus) might have encouraged him to perpetrate the fraud—an appealing notion, if unlikely: Giraldis had died in 1552, fully twenty-five years before the composition of the elegy. It is tempting, though, to hypothesize along these lines that Didacus forged his new version of Gallus to show up the absurdity of Maximianus-Gallus, deliberately seeding his composition with false notes derived from Maximianus, just as mapmakers used to introduce tell-tale errors to assert their copyright over their creations.

Kayachev and Shumilin argue that 'the character of the textual variants [between the three redactions of 1578, 1588 and 1594] seems to confirm that the Gallan poems are not a humanistic forgery, but come, as is claimed in the accompanying texts, from a damaged manuscript' (214–15). But such arguments had already been tersely dismissed by Scaliger in 1600: 'This was their intention in the wretched elegy ascribed to Cornelius Gallus, in which they left lacunae and omitted entire lines: to lend credibility to its antiquity by reason of erasures and damaged text' ('Id fecerunt in Elegia ineptissima, nomine Cornelii Galli, in qua lacunas reliquerunt, et versus integros omiserunt, ut fidem facerent vetustatis ex lituris et obsoleta lectione', cited by Fontanini, p. 60). Certainly it was not beyond the wit of Didacus to send out three different versions of the text at different times as part of a deliberate strategy of mystification; it seems probable, too, that some of the differences in the 1588 text are due to the silent editorial interventions of Aldus on the factitiously lacunose text provided to him by Didacus, which very likely differed already from both the 1578 and 1594 versions: after all, Didacus had expressly asked him to do precisely this (as indeed he had asked Achilles Statius in 1578). Kayachev and Shumilin base their arguments on an unspoken assumption that the putative 'humanistic forger' would necessarily be an unsophisticated forger. And Didacus Pyrrhus was most certainly not an unsophisticated forger.

Aldus, in fact, clearly wanted to be seen to be preserving the lacunosity of the text in print, seeing it as a selling point and a marker of its authentic antiquity. His title page boasted that he himself was that one who had been the first to 'rescue' the poem 'from the shadows' ('nunc primum e tenebris eruta'), and he wrote in a note that 'we have deliberately left untouched the parts of the text that were corrupted by ravages

of time' ('Quae in hac Elegia vitio temporis corrupta videbatur, ea intacta reliquimus'). This is the characteristic language of humanist antiquarian and philological endeavour, which fetishized the 'fragment'. Back at the start of the century, Gaurico had given the title *Cornelii Galli fragmenta* to his compilation of texts (which are not in fact 'fragments' in any accepted sense of the word), in order to evoke a sense that these were the diligently gathered remains of a lost poetic monument of venerable antiquity. Gaurico's elegy, written in imitation of the style of the revived 'Gallus', was an attempt to remake the elegiac corpus of Maximianus in this image, and to read it as bearing paradoxical witness to its own loss and miraculous survival. The attempt was a partial success among humanists eager to believe that deficiencies in the text were evidence not of lateness but of authentic firstness. Didacus Pyrrhus went further: in manufacturing from the materials of the Latin elegiac tradition a counterfeited remnant of the very beginning of that tradition, he was taking the humanist project of *imitatio* to its limits, revelling in its logic of anachronism.

Notes

- 1 See e.g. Alexandre Nicolas, *De la vie et des ouvrages de Caius Cornélius Gallus* (Paris, 1851), pp. 97–100, who mistakenly thought that Scaliger had made the same accusation. Jean Passerat had noted in his commentary on Propertius (written before 1597 and published posthumously in 1608) that rumours to this effect were circulating: *Commentarii in C. Catullum, A. Tibullum, et S. A. Propertium* (Paris: C. Morel, 1608), p. 588.
- 2 The relevant texts, first published by Chatelain, Körbler and Salanitro, have been compiled by Boris Kayachev and Mikhail Shumilin, 'Four Poems Ascribed to Gallus (AL 914–917): The History of the Text', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, 78.1 (2017), 195–225.
- 3 For a bibliography of his works, see G. Hugo Tucker, 'Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus (1517–1599), Poet of Exile', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 41 (1992), 175–98.
- 4 In *Commentariolus Ludovici Cervarii Tuberonis De Origine & incremento Urbis Rhacusanae* (1790), p. 66; and *Della vita e degli scritti di Didaco Pirro altramenti detto Iacopo Flavio Eborense, commentario di Tommaso Chersa* (1826), pp. 1, 22–3.
- 5 Lines quoted by Đuro Körbler, *Život i rad humanista Didaka Pira Portugalca, napose u Dubrovniku* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1916), p. 143. See the description and analysis of this poem by Darko Novakovic, 'Didacus Pyrrhus as "Lusor Amorum": Unpublished Love-Elegies from the Manuscript Da 29 in the Historical Institute of Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Dubrovnik', *Euphrosyne: Revista de Filologia Clásica* 26 (1998), 399–408 (403). This poem is also one of the many poems of Didacus that exhibit a noteworthy verbal similarity to a line from the Aldine elegy: Novakovic, p. 406, n. 21.

- 6 From the *Epigrammatum libellus* in: *Flavii Iacobi Eborensis Cato Minor* (Venice, 1596); online edition by Neven Jovanović <<http://www.ffzg.unizg.hr/klafile/croala/cgi-bin/navigate.pl?croala.300>>.
- 7 'Da columbatim mitia Basia: / Sugis amentis partem animi: / Cor mihi penetrant haec tua Basia. / Quid mihi sugis vivum sanguinem?', with a possible conflation with Ovid's line about Gallus: 'sanguinis atque animae prodige Galle tuae' (*Am.* 3.64). The 'leech' image also makes an appearance in a 'kiss' poem by Lernutius, but differently framed (see Wong, *The Poetry of Kissing* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2017), pp. 185–6).
- 8 Didacus also wrote other poems to 'Lycoris', e.g. the hendecasyllabic 'Didaci Pyrrhi Lusitani de Lycoride, et Amore, ad Faletum' included in *Hieronymi Faleti de Bello Sicambrico Libri IIII* (1557), 131v; and another on Lycoris ('Ala') at 136r. He also imitated *Lydia bella puella candida* in the poem 'Ad amicam' in that volume ('Conde istas mihi lacteas papillas' etc.), 132v.
- 9 'Eas vero sorores meritorias puellas fuisse, quae cum laena matre ex Illyrio castra Romana in Persiam usque sequerentur, existimat' (Emile Chatelain, 'L'Origine des prétendus fragments de Gallus', *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, 4 (1880), 69–79 (75)). The idea was perhaps suggested to Didacus by *Ecl.* 10, where 'tua cura Lycoris / perque niues alium perque horrida castra secuta est.'
- 10 Letter to Gruyter, *Opuscula varia ante hac non edita* (1612), p. 411: quoted by A. Nicolas, p. 99.
- 11 Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015). see also the recent collective volume edited by Francisco Javier Martínez García, *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature: ergo decipiatur!* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014).
- 12 The text of the two letters sent to Statius is printed by Chatelain, 'L'Origine', pp. 70–6.
- 13 Kayachev and Shumilin, 'Four Poems', pp. 200–1, n.3, attribute the 1578 letter to Didacus on the basis of the handwriting. See also the brief discussion by Carlos Ascenso André, *Um judeu no desterro: Diogo Pires e a memória de Portugal* (Coimbra: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica, 1992), p. 24, for the possibility that Didacus was in Thessaloniki in 1578.
- 14 A fact noticed by Maria Salanitro, 'Prove di autenticità dell'elegia 914 R. attribuita a Gallo', *Maia: rivista di letteratura classiche*, 63 (2011), p. 71, who, however, ingeniously took this as further proof for the poem's authenticity.
- 15 *Epigrammata et poemata vetera*, ed. Pithou (Paris, 1590), p. 418.
- 16 See Salanitro, 'Prove di autenticità', p. 64.
- 17 The text and paratexts are almost identical in the manuscript of Didacus' *Elegiarum Libri Tres* (D. a. 29 (Dubrovnik)). Novakovic wrongly states that 'Non fuit Arsacidum' is, in the manuscript, 'explicitly described [...] as the work of Gallus' ('Didacus Pyrrhus', p. 405): other than in the portions of the paratext copied from the Aldine edition, the claim made for it is simply that it has been previously published under the name of Gallus. Kayachev and Shumilin must be right to suggest that the printed edition derived from the MS collection, rather than the other way around ('Four Poems', p. 206). For the text quoted from the 1594 edition and from the manuscript, I rely

on the descriptions and extracts published by Körbler, Novakovic, Salanitro, and Kayachev and Shumilin.

- 18 Unlike Didacus, Muret had managed to fool Joseph Scaliger: see Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), vol. 1, p. 161.
- 19 'Ut desiderio nostri curaque Lycoris, / Heu! iaceat menses paene sepulta novem.'; 'Nonus adest mensis, fatalis et appetit hora / Iam vagus Hetrusca rumor in urbe sonat. / Quid sit, in incerto est, at languet regia coniux, / At soror invicti Caesaris aegra gemit.' The Joanna elegy is most readily accessible in *Urbani Appendini ... Carmina. Accedunt Selecta Illustrum Ragusinarum Poemata* (Ragusa, 1811), pp. 218–20.
- 20 'Vindicat, Augusti Caesaris auspiciis' (56); 'Spirat in augusta fronte serenus honos' (22).
- 21 Peirano, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake*, esp. pp. 180, 200 on *Ciris*.

Conclusion

The Renaissance Gallus enjoyed a longer posterity than the ancient Gallus—or at least a better attested posterity. Through the eighteenth century some scholars remained adamant in their attribution to Cornelius Gallus of the elegiacs of Maximianus, together with the forgeries of Didacus Pyrrhus: one such was Matthieu Chiniac de La Bastide, who explained away the faults perceived by other readers in Maximianus as merely features of the ‘late style’ of an elderly Gallus, the conventional chronology having been rejected.¹ Editions of the ‘poems of Gallus’ collecting the works ascribed to him in the Renaissance were still being produced in the nineteenth century, albeit with a slightly more cautious approach to attribution. For example, Jean Genouille’s 1836 translation and commentary edition of the *Poésies de Cornelius Gallus* collected items 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 (see Appendix), giving a reasonably thorough scholarly introduction based mainly on Wernsdorf: from this selection, Genouille explicitly vouched only for the line transmitted by Vibius Sequester, but found the authenticity of the Didacus Pyrrhus forgeries ‘très-probable’.² And readers were still responding to these poems in imaginative ways. If W. A. Becker’s famous historical novel *Gallus, oder, römische Scenen aus der Zeit Augusts* (1838; translated into English as *Gallus; or, Roman scenes of the time of Augustus*) took a rigorous approach to the sources, there were still those who found the Renaissance Gallus a more alluring prospect. Paul Lacroix, writing under the pseudonym Pierre Dufour, included in the second volume of his *Histoire de la prostitution chez tous les peuples du monde* (1851) a chapter on the sex lives of Tibullus, Gallus and Ovid.³ He invented a titillating narrative of the life and loves of Cornelius Gallus (pp. 337–41), a fantasy fuelled by extravagant readings of the forgeries of Didacus Pyrrhus and of the *Carmen ad Lydiam*, with the odd concession to more reliable sources. In this account, Gallus returned from the Parthian campaign only to find that Lycoris had abandoned him, so he turned his affections to other courtesans: first the sisters Gentia and Chloe, and then

Lydia. By 1851, the elegies of Maximianus could no longer be part of this narrative, but Lacroix did his best to include them nonetheless, since Maximianus ‘mérita d’être confondu avec Cornelius Gallus’: Lacroix’s account of Lycoris’s rejection of Gallus when he returned from the Parthian wars (‘elle avait pris des amants’) is accordingly influenced by the second elegy of Maximianus.

For readers throughout the majority of the post-classical era, the Gaius Cornelius Gallus celebrated by Virgil and canonized by the Augustan elegists was dead, his works lost forever. The Gaius Cornelius Gallus reborn in the sixteenth century, ‘happy that he had not utterly perished by his own hand’,⁴ lived on, and the forged and misattributed works published under his name left their mark on literary history.

Notes

- 1 Matthieu de La Bastide and Louis D’Ussieux, *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, 2 vols (Paris, 1772), I, 57–86 and esp. 303–12.
- 2 The pseudo-Gallan poems had been previously collected and translated into French by Pezay in 1771 (with the text but not translation of Maximianus, here ‘Maximianus Gallus’), by Noël in 1803 (without Maximianus), and by Saint-Amand in 1818 (without Maximianus); and then, in a much reprinted edition, by Nisard with Louis Puget in 1839 (with Maximianus). The twentieth century saw at least one revival of the Renaissance Gallus, in the form of Carlo Carena’s translation edition of Cornelius Gallus, *Versi d’amore* (Florence: Fussi: Sansoni, 1951).
- 3 Cf. earlier erotic biographies of the elegists in the ‘histoire galante’ genre, such as Jean de la Chapelle’s *Amours de Catulle* (1680) and *Amours de Tibulle* (1712–1713). Mme de Villedieu’s influential *Les Exilés de la cour d’Auguste* (1672–1678) had featured Cornelius Gallus as a character (‘Histoire de Cornelius Gallus’, III partie).
- 4 ‘Gaudet / Se penitus dextra non cecidisse sua’: from the commendatory epigram by Joannes Baptista Rhamnusius in Gaurico’s *Cornelii Galli Fragmenta*.

Appendix

Editiones principes of works ascribed to Gallus, or date of first attribution to Gallus in print*

Before 1600

1. 1472: *Temporibus laetis tristamur*

Epigram of ten elegiac lines. The attribution to Gallus, obviously anachronistic since the epigram laments Virgil's death, goes back to the eleventh century. The epigram has been attributed to Ovid, but is probably late antique: see *AL* 242; critical edition in Navarro López 1998: 155–62. Attributed to Cornelius Gallus by Pietro Crinito, *De poet. lat.*, 1505; had already appeared in print under the title 'Cornelii Galli versus' in many of the earliest printed editions of Virgil from Venice 1472 and Padua 1472 onwards.

2. 1488: the line 'Praxitelis manibus vivo iterum Niobe'

Attributed to Gallus in Dionysius Nestor, *Vocabularia* (Venice, 1488), fol. 148^v, but in fact from an epigram of Ausonius imitated from the Greek Anthology: *Epig.* 57 in Green's OCT (1999).

3. 1502 (January 1501 *more veneto*): six elegies of Maximianus

Attributed to Gallus in a group of C15 MSS, and then by Pomponio Gaurico in *Cornelii Galli Fragmenta* (Venice: Bernardinus Venetus de Vitalibus, 1501 [=1502]). The *princeps* of the elegiacs of Maximianus is Utrecht 1474.

4. 1502 (January 1501 *more veneto*): *Lydia bella puella candida*

Rhythmic poem of 25 lines. It was first printed with attribution to Gallus together with the Maximianus elegies in Gaurico's 1502 edition, and in numerous editions thereafter. In the earliest MS of the poem (ca. 1450) it is signed 'per Galum poet[am]' (Mariotti, 'Cornelii Galli hendecasyllabi', in *Scritti medievali e umanistici*, Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1976, pp. 158–9); it had also appeared, in abbreviated form, together with Maximianus in at least one fifteenth-century manuscript (Schetter, *Studien*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970, p. 72).

5. 1564: the line ‘Durum rus fugite laboriosum’

Hendecasyllabic line by Calvus (Calvus fr. 2 Courtney; fr. 35 Hollis). In his *Fragmenta poetarum veterum Latinorum* (Geneva, 1564), p. 414, Henri Estienne noted the attribution to ‘Gallus’ in Nonius Marcellus, but acknowledged that the line had been attributed to Calvus in the form ‘durum rus fugis et laboriosum’ by Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 9.12. Modern editions of Nonius read ‘Calvus’.

6. 1567: Εἰς Τάνταλον ἐπὶ ποτηρίου γελυμμένον (‘On Tantalus carved on a cup’)

Epigram in Greek of six elegiac lines. Attributed to Cornelius Gallus by Natalis Comes (Natale Conti) in his *Mythologiae* (1567), fol. 190v in 1568 edn. From the Planudean appendix to the Greek Anthology (16.89 in vol. 5 of Henderson’s Loeb), where it is attributed to a ‘Gallus’.

7. 1588: Non fuit Arsacidum tanti expugnare Seleucen

AL 914 Riese. Elegiac poem of 100 lines, forged by Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus. There are three redactions of variable length: in a 1578 MS letter sent to Achilles Statius; the Aldine printed edition of 1588; and another edition, Venice 1594, deriving from a MS collection including *Didaci Pyrrhi Elegiarum libri tres*. See ‘A Synoptic Edition of *AL* 914–917’ in Kayachev and Shumilin, ‘Four poems’, *Materiali e Discussioni per l’analisi dei Testi Classici*, 78.1 (2017), 219–25.

8. 1588: Occurris cum mane mihi, ni purior ipsa (epigram of 4 lines)**9. 1588: ... matris amor delictumque meum** (incomplete epigram of 15 lines)**10. 1588: Subrides si, uirgo, faces iocularis ocellis** (incomplete epigram of 3 lines)

AL 915–7 Riese. Elegiacs, forged by Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus. ‘A Synoptic Edition of *AL* 914–917’ in Kayachev and Shumilin, ‘Four poems’, *Materiali e Discussioni per l’analisi dei Testi Classici*, 78.1 (2017), 219–25.

After 1600**11. 1618: Ciris**

Friedrich Taubmann in his commentary on Virgil’s *Eclogues* (Wittenberg, 1618), p. 66, reported that Obertus Giphanius (1534–1604) had attributed *Ciris* to Gallus; followed by Kaspar von Barth in his 1624 *Adversaria*, and taken up by others including Fontanini. The attribution was revived by Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Fruhzeit* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901), pp. 136–7; and see now B. Kayachev, *Allusion and Allegory: Studies in the Ciris*

(Berlin: Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2016), which also argues in favour of attribution to a pre-Virgilian poet, possibly Gallus.

12. 1624: the line ‘uno tellures dividit amne duas’

Genuine pentameter line transmitted in the *De fluminibus* of Vibius Sequester (Gallus fr. 1 Courtney; fr. 144 Hollis). The formal attribution to Gallus in scholarship does not appear to be earlier than 1624, in Kaspar von Barth, *Adversaria* book 41 ch. 26, p. 1862, although the work of Vibius has been known since Petrarch (see Franzoi (ed.), *Le elegie di Massimiano*, (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2014), p. 56, n. 138).

13. 1742: ‘Tu procul a patria [...] crescetis amores’ (Virgil, *Ecl.* 10.46–54)

Fontanini (*Historiae literariae aquilejensis libri V*, p. 35) believed these nine lines to have been transcribed verbatim from a poem by Gallus. A variable number of lines from the tenth eclogue had previously been ascribed to Gallus, on the basis of Servius’s comment ad *Ecl.* 10.46 ‘hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus’; the modern scholarly consensus is that Virgil’s hexameters are not a direct transcription of lines by Gallus.

14. 1974: *O mei procul ite nunc amores!*

Neo-Catullan hendecasyllabic poem of 47 lines, deriving from a slightly longer poem originally composed by Leonardo Bruni; ascribed to Gallus in some C15 MSS. Mentioned by Schetter, *Studien*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970, pp. 71–3, n. 19; the *princeps* of the complete poem is Mariotti, ‘Cornelii Galli hendecasyllabi’, Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1976, pp. 165–6; see also Hankins, ‘The Latin Poetry of Leonardo Bruni’, *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 39 (1990), 20–7.

15. 1979: Nine lines from the Qaṣr Ibrîm papyrus

Genuine elegiac lines. R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons, and R. G. M. Nisbet, ‘Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm’, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 69 (1979), 125–55. Gallus fr. 2 Courtney; fr. 145 Hollis.

Note

* I exclude here lines falsely attributed to Gallus in the Middle Ages which have no currency in the Renaissance and after, such as those attributed to Gallus by the scholiast of Ovid’s *Ibis* ‘con puerile falsificazione’ (*Scholia in P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibin*, ed. Antonio La Penna (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1959), p. xxx). On these counterfeit verses see also Pierluigi Gatti, *Ovid in Antike und Mittelalter: Geschichte der philologischen Rezeption* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014), pp. 154–63. Augusto Campana found a six-line epigram, *inc.* ‘Plus anima hippolytum’, attributed to Gallus in one manuscript (Mariotti, p. 160, n. 2). Some

nineteenth-century editors make reference to the 'Pervigilium Veneris' having been ascribed to Gallus: Nisard in 1839, for example, included it as part of his 'recueil des poésies attribuées à Gallus', but made no suggestion that such an attribution had ever been taken seriously. The notion probably arose from the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editions that printed the works of the elegists 'cum Galli fragmentis et Pervigilio Veneris' (a possibly ambiguous formulation). A Dutch translation in 1805 paired the *Pervigilium* with *Lydia bella puella candida*, for no other reason than that the two pieces seemed to the translator to complement one another. I also exclude from the list lost works which have been ascribed to Gallus.

Bibliography

Primary

- Appendini, Urbano, *Urbani Appendini ... Carmina. Accedunt Selecta Illustrium Ragusinorum Poemata* (Ragusa: Typis Martecchinianis, 1811).
- Audebert, Germain, *Germani Audeberti Aurelii Venetiae. Ad sereniss. ac sapientiss. Venetiarum principem Nicolaum Deponte et illustriss. atque prudentiss. senatores patricosq. Venetos* (Venice: Aldus Manutius the Younger, 1583).
- Barth, Kaspar von, *Adversariorum Commentariorum Libri. LX* (Frankfurt: Aubry & Schleich, 1624).
- Cervarius, Ludovicus, *Commentariolus Ludovici Cervarii Tuberonis De Origine & incremento Urbis Rhacusanae: His accedit de illustribus Familiis, quae Rhacusae extant ad amplissimum Senatum Elegia Didaci Pyrrhi* (Ragusa: Andrea Trevisan, 1790).
- Chersa, Tomasso, *Della vita e degli scritti di Didaco Pirro altramenti detto Iacopo Flavio Eborens* (Florence: Stamperia Magheri, 1826).
- Colerus, Jacobus, *De animarum immortalitate* (Wittenberg: Clement Schleich, 1587).
- Conti, Natale, *Mythologiae, sive Explicationum fabularum libri decem* (Venice: [ad signum Fontis], 1567).
- Crinito, Pietro, *De poetis latinis* (Florence: Filippo Giunta, 1505).
- Dolet, Etienne, *Carmina* (1538), ed. by Catherine Langlois-Pézeret (Geneva: Droz, 2009).
- Dornavius, Caspar, *Amphitheatrum sapientiae Socraticae ioco-seriae*, 2 vols (Hanau: Wechsel for Aubry & Schleich, 1619).
- Estienne, Henri, *Moschi, Bionis, Theocriti, elegantissimorum poetarum Idyllia aliquot, ab Henrico Stephano Latina facta. Eiusdem carmina non diuersi ab illis argumenti* (Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1555).
- . *Fragmenta poetarum veterum Latinorum* (Geneva: Henri Estienne, 1564).
- Falletti, Gerolamo, *Hieronymi Faletti De bello sicambrico: libri IV et ejusdem alia poemata libri VIII* (Venice: Aldus Manutius, 1557).
- Fontanini, Giusto, *Historiae literariae aquilejensis libri V* (Rome: Nicolaus & Marcus Palearinus, 1742).

- Foscarini, Michele, *Honorii Dominici Caramella ... Museum illustriorum poetarum qui ad haec usque tempora latino carmine scripserunt, cum notis Michaelis Foscareni* (Venice: O. Ferrettus, 1651).
- Fox Morcillo, Sebastián, *De imitatione seu de informandi styli ratione Libri II* (Antwerp: Martinus Nutius, 1554).
- ps.-Gallus, *Cornelii Galli fragmenta* (Venice: Bernadinus Venetus de Vitalibus, 1501 [=1502]).
- . *Catullus. Tibullus. Propertius. Item, Cornelii Galli fragmenta* (Lyon: A. Gryphius, 1573).
- . *Asinii [sic] Cornelii Galli elegia, nunc primum e tenebris eruta ab Aldo Manuccio. Eiusdem epigrammata tria* (Florence: G. Marescotti for Aldus Manutius, 1588).
- . *Cornelii Maximiani Galli Etrusci Elegiae*, in *Ovidii Nasonis Pelignensis Erotica Et Amatoria Opuscula*, ed. by Melchior Goldast (Frankfurt: Wolfgang Richter for Peter Kopf, 1610), pp. 48–70.
- . *Poésies*, ed. and trans. by Jean Genouille (Paris: Panckoucke, 1836).
- . *Oeuvres complètes [...] de Gallus et Maximien [...]*, ed. and trans. by Jean-Marie-Napoléon-Désiré Nisard (Paris: J.-J. Dubochet et Compagnie, 1839).
- . *Versi d'amore*, trans. Carlo Carena (Florence: Fussi: Sansoni, 1951).
- . et al., 'Cornelius Gallus to Lydia: An Anthology of English Translations and Imitations', *Translation and Literature*, 8 (1999), 237–51.
- Giraldi, Lilio, *Historiae poetarum tam Graecorum quam Latinorum dialogi decem* (Basel: [Michael Isengrin], 1545).
- Heinsius, Daniel, *Silius Italicus De secundo bello Punico* (Leiden: C. Raphelengius for Plantin, 1600).
- La Bastide, Matthieu de and Louis D'Ussieux, *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, 2 vols (Paris: Edme, 1772).
- Lachèvre, Frédéric (ed.), *Les Recueils Collectifs de Poesies Libres et Satiriques* (Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1968).
- La Monnoye, Bernard de, *Menagiana ou les bons mots et remarques critiques, historiques, morales et d'érudition de Monsieur Ménage recueillis par ses amis*, vol. 1, 3rd edn (Paris: Florentin Delaulne, 1715).
- La Penna, Antonio (ed.), *Scholia in P. Ovidii Nasonis Ibin* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1959).
- Le Roy, Louis, *Le Sympose de Platon* (Paris: Jehan Longis & Robert Le Mangnyer, 1558).
- Lotichius, Johannes Petrus, *Joh. Petri Lotichii Super poetis Latinis, nov-antiquis, censura, sive promulsis critica* (Frankfurt: Eduard Schleich, 1645).
- Lotichius Secundus, Petrus, *Petri Lotichii Secundi solitariensis poemata omnia* (Amsterdam: Ex officinal Schouteniana, 1754).
- Maximianus, *Ethica suavis et periocunda* (Utrecht: Nicolaus Ketelaer and Gerardus de Leempt, 1474).
- . *Nugarum libellus Maximiani immitis* (Paris: Etienne Jehannot and Pierre Le Dru [ca. 1495]).

- . *The Elegies of Maximianus*, ed. by Richard Webster (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Press, 1900).
- . *Elegie*, ed. by Tullio Agozzino (Bologna: Silva Editore, 1970).
- . *Commentaire des Élégies de Maximien*, ed. by François Spaltenstein (Rome: Institut suisse de Rome, 1983).
- . *Versus Maximiani: der Elegienzyklus textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und neu interpretiert*, ed. by Christina Sandquist Öberg (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1999).
- . *Die elegischen Verse von Maximian: eine letzte Widerrede gegen die neue christliche Zeit : mit den Gedichten der Appendix Maximiana und der Imitatio Maximiani: Interpretation, Text und Übersetzung*, ed. by Wolfgang Christian Schneider (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2003).
- . *Elégies: suivi de l'Appendix Maximiani; et de l'Epithalame pour Maximus d'Ennode de Pavie*, ed. by Benjamin Goldlust (Paris: Belles lettres, 2012).
- . *Le elegie di Massimiano: testo, traduzione e commento*, ed. by Alessandro Franzoi (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 2014).
- . *The Elegies of Maximianus*, ed. by A. M. Juster (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018).
- Meyer, Heinrich, *Anthologia veterum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum* (Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer, 1835).
- Muret, Marc-Antoine, *Sex. Propertius M. Antonii Mureti in eum scholia* (Venice: Paulus Manutius, 1558).
- . *Juvenilia*, ed. by Virginie Leroux (Geneva: Droz, 2009).
- Nestor, Dionysius, *Vocabularia* (Venice: Guilelmus Anima Mia, Tridinisensis, 1488).
- Palladio, Enrico, *Rerum ForoIuliensium libri vndecim* (Udine: Nicolaus Schirattus, 1659).
- Passerat, Jean, *Commentarii in C. Catullum, A. Tibullum, et S. A. Propertium* (Paris: C. Morel, 1608).
- Pyrrhus, Didacus, *Carminum liber unus* (Ferrara: Francesco Rossi, 1545).
- . *Flavii Iacobi Eborensis Cato Minor* (Venice, 1596): online edition by Neven Jovanović <www.ffzg.unizg.hr/klafile/croala/cgi-bin/navigate.pl?croala.300>.
- Ramus, Petrus, *P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolica* (Paris: André Wechel, 1558).
- Rapin, René, *Réflexions sur la poétique d'Aristote et sur les ouvrages des poètes anciens et modernes* (Paris: François Muguet, 1674).
- Riese, Alexander (ed.), *Anthologia Latina, sive, Poesis Latinae supplementum* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1869).
- Ronsard, Pierre de, *Les Oeuvres de P. de Ronsard [...] Tome Premier contenant ses Amours* (Paris: Gabriel Buon, 1560).
- Scaliger, Joseph Justus, *Opuscula varia antehac non edita* (Paris: Jerome Drouart, 1610).
- . *Opuscula varia ante hac non edita* (Frankfurt: Jacobus Fischerus, 1612).
- Scaliger, Julius Caesar, *Poetices libri septem* (Lyon: Antoine Vincent, 1561).
- Taubmann, Friedrich (ed.), *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera omnia* (Wittenberg: Zacharias Schürer, 1618).

- Walker, Hovenden, *The Impotent Lover: Accurately Described in Six Elegies upon Old Age; with the Old Doting Letcher's Resentments on the Past Pleasures and Vigorous Performances of Youth. Made English from the Latin of Cn. Cornelius Gallus. By H. Walker, Gent.* (London: Printed for B. Crayle at the Peacock and Bible at the West end of St. Paul's Church, 1689).
- Wernsdorf, Johann Christian, *Poetae latini minores* (Helmstedt: C. G. Fleckeisen, 1782–1794).
- Zerbis, Gabriele de, *Gerontocomia: On the Care of the Aged*, ed. by L. R. Lind (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1988).

Secondary

- Anderson, R. D., P. J. Parsons, and R. G. M. Nisbet, 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrīm', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 69 (1979), 125–55.
- Andrade, António Manuel Lopes, *A mundividência de Diogo Pires à luz da colectânea poética dos 'Xenia'* (Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos, 2009).
- André, Carlos Ascenso, *Um judeu no desterro: Diogo Pires e a memória de Portugal* (Coimbra: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica, 1992).
- Bellanova, Addolorata, 'La lezione nostalgica di Ovidio negli amori senili di Massimiano', *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Siena*, 25 (2004), 99–124.
- Bertalot, Ludwig, *Studien zum italienischen und deutschen Humanismus*, ed. by Paul Oskar Kristeller (Rome: Storia e letteratura, 1975), vol. II, pp. 333–54 [repr. of 'L'antologia di epigrammi di Lorenzo Abstemio nelle tre edizioni sonciniane', *Misc. Giovanni Mercati* IV (Città del Vaticano, 1946) 305–26].
- Boucher, Jean-Paul, *Caius Cornelius Gallus* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1966).
- Cairns, Francis, *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Capasso, Mario, *Il ritorno di Cornelio Gallo: Il papiro di Qaṣr Ibrīm venticinque anni dopo* (Naples: Graus, 2003).
- Carlson, David Richard, 'Gower's Amans and the Curricular Maximianus', *Studia Neophilologica*, 89 (2017), 67–80.
- Carrai, Stefano, 'Echi massimianeî nella "Sylva in scabiem" di Poliziano', *Interpres*, 8 (1988), 276–82.
- Chatelain, Emile, 'L'Origine des prétendus fragments de Gallus', *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes*, 4 (1880), 69–79.
- Consolino, Franca Ela, 'Massimiano e le sorti dell'elegia latina', in *Mutatio rerum: letteratura, filosofia, scienza tra tardo antico e altomedioevo: atti del convegno di studi (Napoli, 25–26 novembre 1996)*, ed. by Maria Luisa Silvestre and Marisa Squillante (Naples: Città del sole, 1997), pp. 363–400.
- Conte, Gian Biagio, 'Love without Elegy: The Remedia amoris and the Logic of a Genre', *Poetics Today*, 10.3 (1989), 441–69.
- Courtney, Edward, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

- Dixon, Helen, 'Angelo Poliziano's Unpublished Notes on Tibullus in Roma, Corsiniana, 50 F 37', *Medioevo e Rinascimento*, 20.17 (2006), 245–84.
- Ellis, R., 'On the Elegies of Maximianus', *The American Journal of Philology*, 5 (1884), 1–15.
- Fantazzi, Charles, 'The Style of Quattrocento Latin Love Poetry', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 3 (1996), 127–46.
- Feros Ruys, Juanita, 'Medieval Latin Meditations on Old Age: Rhetoric, Autobiography, and Experience', in *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic*, ed. by Albrecht Classen (Berlin; New York: de Gruyter, 2007), pp. 171–200.
- Fielding, Ian, 'A Greek Source for Maximianus' Greek Girl: Late Latin Love Elegy and the Greek Anthology', in *Classics Renewed: Reception and Innovation in the Latin Poetry of Late Antiquity*, ed. by Scott McGill and Joseph Pucci (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2016), pp. 323–39.
- . *Transformations of Ovid in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).
- Fielding, Ian and James Uden, 'Latin Elegy in the Old Age of the World: The Elegiac Corpus of Maximianus', *Arethusa*, 43 (2010), 439–60.
- Franzoi, Alessandro, 'L'Élégie latine tardive: analyse de procédés compositionnels et expressifs dans les "Élégies" de Maximien', in *Au-delà de l'élégie d'amour*, ed. by Laure Chappuis Sandoz (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2011), pp. 159–169.
- Gardner, Hunter H., *Gendering Time in Augustan Love Elegy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Gärtner, Thomas, 'Der letzte klassische Elegiker? Zur Deutung der erotischen Dichtungen Maximians', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft*, 7 (2004), 119–161.
- . 'Der strukturelle Aufbau der "Amores" des Konrad Celtis vor dem Hintergrund antiker Vorbilder', in *Würzburger Humanismus*, ed. by Thomas Baier and Jochen Schultheiss, *NeoLatina*, 23 (Tübingen: Narr Verlag, 2015), pp. 37–45.
- Gatti, Pierluigi, *Ovid in Antike und Mittelalter: Geschichte der philologischen Rezeption* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2014).
- Goldlust, Benjamin, 'Parcours narratif et parcours poétique dans les "Élégies" de Maximien', *Revue des études latines*, 89 (2011), 154–73.
- Grafton, Anthony, *Forgers and Critics: Creativity and Duplicity in Western Scholarship* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990).
- Hankins, James, 'The Latin Poetry of Leonardo Bruni', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 39 (1990), 1–39.
- Hartung, Albert E., 'The Non-Comic Merchant's Tale, Maximianus, and the Sources', *Mediaeval Studies*, XXIX (1967), 1–25.
- Hollis, Adrian S, *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c.60 B.C.–A.D. 20* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Jaitner-Hahner, Ursula, 'Maximian und der *fucus italicus*. Ein unbekannter Textzeuge', in *Litterae Medii Aevi. Festschrift für J. Autenrieth zu ihrem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Michael Borgolte and Herrad Spilling (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1988), pp. 277–92.

- Kayachev, Boris, *Allusion and Allegory: Studies in the Ciris* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2016).
- . and Mikhail Shumilin, 'Four Poems Ascribed to Gallus (AL 914–917): The History of the Text', *Materiali e Discussioni per l'analisi dei Testi Classici*, 78.1 (2017), 195–225.
- Kazakova, Elena, 'Strategies of Unification in Joachim Du Bellay's Translations for Louis Le Roy', *MLN*, 126 (2012), 738–53.
- Körbler, Đuro, *Život i rad humanista Didaka Pira Portugalca, napose u Dubrovniku* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1916).
- Kossaifi, Christine, 'Jadis et maintenant: à propos de l'Élégie III de Maximianus', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 3 (2000), 230–4.
- Kretschmer, Marek Thue, 'The Love Elegy in Medieval Latin Literature', in *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*, ed. by T. S. Thorsen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 271–89.
- Laumonier, Paul, *Ronsard, poète lyrique: étude historique et littéraire* (Paris: Hachette et cie, 1909).
- Lavery, Hannah, *The Impotency Poem from Ancient Latin to Restoration English Literature* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016).
- Leuker, Tobias, *Angelo Poliziano: Dichter, Redner, Stratege: eine Analyse der Fabula di Orpheo und ausgewählter lateinischer Werke des Florentiner Humanisten* (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1997).
- Ludwig, Walther, 'Platons Kuß und seine Folgen', *Illinois Classical Studies*, 14 (1989), 435–47.
- Lupis, Vinicije B., 'Amatus Lusitanus e Didaco Pirro: due ebrei portoghesi e cerchia umanistica di Dubrovnik', in *Humanismo e ciência: antiguidade e Renascimento*, ed. by Antonio Manuel Lopes Andrade, Carlos de Miguel Mora, and João Manuel Nunes Torrão (Aveiro: Universidade de Aveiro, 2015), pp. 481–512.
- Manzoni, Gian Enrico, *Foroiuliensis Poeta: Vita e poesia di Cornelio Gallo* (Milan: Vita e pensiero, 1995).
- Mariotti, Scevola, 'Cornelii Galli Hendecasyllabi', in *Scritti medievali e umanistici* (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1976), pp. 157–80 [= *Tra latino e volgare. Per Carlo Dionisotti* (Padua, 1974), vol. 2, pp. 545–68].
- Martínez García, Francisco Javier (ed.), *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature: ergo decipiatur!* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014).
- Mauger-Plichon, Brigitte, 'Maximianus: un mystérieux poète', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 4 (1999), 369–87.
- Merriam, C. U., 'The New Gallus Revisited', *Latomus*, 49 (1990), 443–452.
- Meyers, Jean, 'La Figure du vieillard dans les "Élégies" de Maximien: autobiographie ou fiction?', in *L'Ancienneté chez les anciens*, ed. by Béatrice Bakhouché. Bakhouché (Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier III, 2003), pp. 697–715.
- Naeke, August Ferdinand, *Augusti Ferdinandi Naekii Opuscula philologica* (Bonn: Eduard Weber, 1842).
- Navarro López, Joaquín, '"Anthologia Latina" 914 Riese: Galo falsificado', *Calamus Renascens*, 1 (2000), 247–58.

- . 'Aproximación a Cornelio Galo en el Renacimiento', in *Congreso Internacional sobre Humanismo y Renacimiento* (León: Universidad de León, vol. I 1998), pp. 517–27.
- . 'Biografías renacentistas de Cornelio Galo (I)', *Excerpta Philologica*, 7.8 (1997), 169–94.
- . 'El prólogo de Aldo Manucio el Joven a su edición de unos presuntos poemas de Cornelio Galo', *Calamus Renascens*, 3 (2002), 147–56.
- . 'Epigrama "Occurris cum mane" (Anth. 915 Riese)', *Excerpta Philologica*, 9 (1999), 277–84.
- Nicastri, Luciano, *Cornelio Gallo e l'elegia ellenistico-romana: studio dei nuovi frammenti* (Naples: M. D'Auria, 1984).
- Nicolas, Alexandre, *De la vie et des ouvrages de Caius Cornélius Gallus* (Paris: Imprimerie de Belin-Mandar, 1851).
- Niebuhr, Barthold Georg, 'Ueber das Alter des Lieds Lydia Bella Puella', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Geschichte und Griechische Philosophie* 3.1 (1829), 1–8.
- Novakovic, Darko, 'Didacus Pyrrhus as "Lusor Amorum": Unpublished Love-Elegies from the Manuscript Da 29 in the Historical Institute of Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Dubrovnik', *Euphrosyne: Revista de Filología Clásica*, 26 (1998), 399–408.
- O'Hara, James J., 'War and the Sweet Life: The Gallus Fragment and the Text of Tibullus 1.10.11', *The Classical Quarterly*, 55 (2005), 317–19.
- Peirano, Irene, *The Rhetoric of the Roman Fake: Latin Pseudepigrapha in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Pintacuda, Paolo, 'Una versione castigiana cinquecentesca del carne "Ad Lydiam"', *Tradurre* (2014) <<http://ojs.cimedoc.uniba.it/index.php/trd/article/view/319>> [accessed 25 July 2017].
- Ratkowitsch, Christine, *Maximianus amat: zu Datierung und Interpretation des Elegikers Maximian* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986).
- Robert, Jörg, *Konrad Celtis und das Projekt der deutschen Dichtung: Studien zur humanistischen Konstitution von Poetik, Philosophie, Nation und Ich* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003).
- Ross, David O, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).
- Salanitro, Maria, 'Il "topos" "la donna è mobile" con ἀπροσδόκητον', *Maia: rivista di letterature classiche*, 60 (2008), 163–92.
- . 'L' elegia 914 R. e il carne 427 R2', *Maia: rivista di letterature classiche*, 60 (2008), 408–10.
- . 'Prove di autenticità dell'elegia 914 R. attribuita a Gallo', *Maia: rivista di letterature classiche*, 63 (2011), 63–83.
- Schetter, Willy, *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik des Elegikers Maximian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970).
- Schneider, Wolfgang Christian, 'Definition of Genre by Falsification: The False Attribution of the Maximianus Verses to Cornelius Gallus by Pomponius Gauricus and the "Definition" of Their Genre and Structure', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica*, 129 (2001), 445–64.

Skutsch, Franz, *Aus Vergils Fruehzeit* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1901).

Szövérfy, Joseph, 'Maximianus a Satirist?', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, LXXII (1967), 351–67.

Tucker, G. Hugo, 'Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus (1517–1599), Poet of Exile', *Humanistica Lovaniensia*, 41 (1992), 175–98.

———. 'Erotisme, parodie, et l'art du centon dans le *Gallus* (1543; *Centones ex Virgilio*, 1555) de Lelio Capilupi', in *Syntagmatia: Essays on Neo-Latin Literature in Honour of Monique Mund-Dopchie and Gilbert Tournoy*, ed. by Dirk Sacré and Jan Papy (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), pp. 329–43.

Wasył, Anna Maria, *Genres Rediscovered: Studies in Latin Miniature Epic, Love Elegy, and Epigram of the Romano-Barbaric Age* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2011).

Wong, Alex, *The Poetry of Kissing in Early Modern Europe: From the Catullan Revival to Secundus, Shakespeare and the English Cavaliers* (Cambridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2017).

Index

- Accius 8, 9, 52, 54
 Afranius 8, 9
 Aldegati, Marcantonio 28
 Aldine elegiacs 2–3, 38–58, 62; *see*
 also Didacus Pyrrhus
 Aldus Manutius the Younger 38, 49,
 52–3, 55–6
 Allegretti, Jacopo 29 n.3
 Amariton, Jean 31
 anachronism 6, 38, 54–5, 56, 61
 atheism 32
 Audebert, Germain 33
 Augustus 2, 32, 38, 47 n.2
 Ausonius 32, 61
- Baïf, Jean-Antoine de 28
 Barth, Kaspar von 3 n.1, 20, 47 n.7,
 62, 63
 Becker, W. A. 59
 Belleau, Remy 33
 Beroaldo, Filippo 16 n.15
 Boethius 6, 12
 Broukhusius, Janus 19, 21
 Bruni, Leonardo 32, 63
 Burman the Younger, Pieter
 36 n.12
 Burton, Robert 31, 32
- Caecilius 8, 9
 Calepino, Ambrogio 31
 Callimachus 2
 Calvus 62
 Campana, Augusto 26, 53, 63 n.1
 Capilupi, Laelio 32
- ‘Carmen ad Lydiam’ 2, 16 n.2, 25–30,
 31, 34, 50–1, 57 n.8, 59, 61, 64 n.1;
 manuscripts 29 n.4; metre 25
 Cassius of Parma 52–3
 Castellanus, Lilius 16 n.11, n.12
 Catrou, François 45
 Catullus 2, 5, 21, 27, 28, 32, 34
 Celtis, Konrad 33–4, 50
 cento 32
 Chapelle, Jean de la 60 n.3
 Chersa, Tommaso 49–50
 Chretien, Florent 35 n.8
Ciris 45, 62–3
 Cohen, Isaac *see* Didacus Pyrrhus
 Comes, Natalis *see* Conti, Natale
 Conti, Natale 62
 Cotta, Giovanni 28
 Crassus, Marcus Licinius 40, 42
 Crinito, Pietro 5, 20, 61
- Dei, Battista 16 n.12
 Didacus Pyrrhus 3, 49–58, 59, 62; *see*
 also Aldine elegiacs
 Dolet, Etienne 33
 Donatus, Aelius 38
 drunkenness 5, 7, 32
 Du Bellay, Joachim 27
 Dufour, Pierre *see* Lacroix, Paul
- Ennius 8, 9
 Eobanus Hessus 20
 Erasmus 33
 Estienne, Henri 36 n.18, 62
 Euphorion 2

- Ferrand, Jacques 32
 Flavius, Jacobus *see* Didacus Pyrrhus
 Fletcher, John 28
 florilegia 31–2
 Fontanini, Giusto 5, 62, 63
 forgery 1, 35 n.6, 49–58, 63 n.1
 Foscarini, Michele 20
 Foscolo, Ugo 37 n.24
 Fox Morcillo, Sebastián 20–1
- Gallus, Gaius Cornelius: author of
Amores 11; confusion with Gaius
 Asinius Gallus 38; as ‘Cornelius
 Maximanus Gallus Etruscus’ 6;
damnatio memoriae 10; described as
 ‘durior’ 6, 20–1; in medieval
 literature 4, 63 n.1; prefect of
 Roman Egypt 2, 6, 7; suicide 2, 10,
 60; *see also* Qaṣr Ibrīm papyrus
- Gaurico, Pomponio 1, 2, 4–11, 13, 14,
 19, 27–8, 34, 44, 46, 50, 56, 61
- Gellius, Aulus 62
 Genouille, Jean 38, 59
 gerontology 31
 Gifanius, Obertus 47 n.7, 62
 Giralaldi, Lilio 5, 17 n.18, 19, 55
 Godefroy, Pierre 32
 Goldast, Melchior 6, 19
- Heinsius, Daniel 38
 Horace 15 n.1, 17 n.17, 21, 31, 33
- Illyria 51–2
 impotence 7, 17 n.17, 22, 31, 44
- Jerome 44
 Joanna of Austria 53–4
 Juvenal 17 n.17
- La Bastide, Matthieu de 59
 Lacroix, Paul 59–60
lena 39, 44
 Leo X (Pope) 32
 Lernutius, Janus 57 n.7
 Livy 8, 9
 Lotichius Secundus, Petrus 33, 46
 Lotichius, Johannes Petrus 20
 Lucilius 8, 9
 Lucretius 21, 22
 Ludwig, Walther 26
- Lycoris 1, 4, 6, 10, 12–13, 28, 39, 41,
 44–5, 50–1, 59–60
 Lydia bella puella candida *see*
 ‘Carmen ad Lydiam’
- Major, Georg 31
 Mariotti, Scevola 2, 61
 Martial 1, 17 n.20
 Matthew of Vendôme 29 n.7
 Maximianus: ‘Appendix Maximiani’
 29 n.7; Aquilina 4, 12; Candida 4;
 dating 4, 15 n.3; *ethicus* 4–5, 6;
 ‘Greek girl’ 4, 11, 22, 35 n.8;
 memory 4, 11–13; metapoetic
 readings 2, 10, 11–15; parody
 13–14; as poet of old age 31, 33–4,
 44, 45–6; publication history before
 attribution to Gallus 4–5; reasons for
 attribution to Gallus 6–7; school
 author 4–5, 6; style 20, 21; *see also*
 Lycoris
- Milton, John 19
 Minos 39, 42
 Mirabelli, Domenico 31
 Molza, Francesco 28
 Montaigne, Michel de 19, 21–2, 31,
 35 n.1
 Muret, Marc-Antoine 21, 28, 33, 52, 54
- Naeke, August Ferdinand 27
 Nestor, Dionysius 61
 ‘New Gallus’ *see* Qaṣr Ibrīm papyrus
 Niebuhr, Barthold Georg 26–7
 Niger, Marius 32
 ‘Non fuit Arsacidum’ *see* Aldine
 elegiacs
 Nonius Marcellus 62
- obscenity 32
 Octavian *see* Augustus
 Ovid 1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 17 n.17, 20, 34, 44,
 46, 61, 63 n.1
- Pacuvius 8, 9
 Palladio, Enrico 20
 Panormita 26
 Parthenius 2
 Parthia 2, 44, 45, 59
 Passerat, Jean 56 n.1
 Persius 21

- Pervigilium Veneris* 63–4 n.1
 Pires, Diogo *see* Didacus Pyrrhus
 Pithou, Pierre 52–3
 Poelmann, Theodore 5
 Poliziano, Angelo 19, 28, 32–3
 Pontano, Giovanni 26, 33, 50
 Propertius 1, 2, 5, 16 n.15, 20, 21, 34, 49–50
 Pulmannus *see* Poelmann, Theodore

 Qaşr İbrîm papyrus 1, 45, 63
 Quintilian 20–1

 Rabelais 47 n.5
 Ragusa (Dubrovnik) 49–50, 52
 Ramus, Petrus 19–20
 Rapin, René 21
 Rhamnusius, Johannes Baptista 10, 60
 Riese, Alexander 2, 38
 Ronsard, Pierre de 28, 33

 Sainte Marthe, Scevole de 36 n.18
 Salmon Macrin, Jean 28
 Scaliger, Joseph Justus 2, 16 n.11, 38, 52, 55
 Scaliger, Julius Caesar 5
 Scylla 39, 42, 47 n.7
 Secundus, Johannes 28
senex amator 7, 17 n.17, 33–4, 44–6, 50–1
 Servius 11, 47 n.4, 63

 Shakespeare, William 22 n.1, 28
 Sordo, Michael de 49–50
 Statius, Achilles 49, 52–3, 54, 55, 62

 Tarpeia 39–40, 42
 Taubmann, Friedrich 47 n.7, 62
 Textor, Ravisius 31–2
 Tibullus 2, 5, 20, 21, 34, 45, 46, 49–50, 59
 Titius, Robertus 6, 16 n.11
 Trabea 52, 54

ubi sunt 1, 8–9

 Varius 8, 9
 Varro 8, 9
 Ventidius, Publius 2, 40, 42, 44, 45
 Vibius Sequester 3 n.1, 59, 63
 Villedieu, Alexandre de 5
 Villedieu, Mme de 60 n.3
 Virgil 1, 19, 21–2, 32, 45, 61, 62, 63
vituperatio senectutis 31, 33

 Wernsdorf, Johann Christian 2, 5–6, 38, 59
 Widebramus, Fredericus 20
 William of Blois 29 n.7

 Zerbi, Gabriele 31



Taylor & Francis Group
an informa business

Taylor & Francis eBooks

www.taylorfrancis.com

A single destination for eBooks from Taylor & Francis with increased functionality and an improved user experience to meet the needs of our customers.

90,000+ eBooks of award-winning academic content in Humanities, Social Science, Science, Technology, Engineering, and Medical written by a global network of editors and authors.

TAYLOR & FRANCIS EBOOKS OFFERS:

A streamlined experience for our library customers

A single point of discovery for all of our eBook content

Improved search and discovery of content at both book and chapter level

REQUEST A FREE TRIAL
support@taylorfrancis.com

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group

 **CRC Press**
Taylor & Francis Group